THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXVI—OCTOBER, 1901—No. 104.

THE WORK OF THE PHILIPPINE COMMISSION.

THE making of a Constitution extempore is a political task often attempted in theory, but rarely successful in practice. It took two or three years to get the Constitution of our own land fitted for use, though every State of the thirteen had already a republican government. The experience of the States of Spanish America is sufficient to show how hard is the task of making a national Constitution, even where foreign interference is absent. Our own State Constitutions, with the making or mending of which the public mind is familiar, are wholly different from the work of modeling the institutions of a people. In the American States the Constitution is the basis of national life and the State Constitutions merely adaptations to it of local conditions. The history of France may show how difficult is the work of changing the social and political organization of a people according to theories of politicians, even when attempted by the chosen delegates of an intelligent people. The English Cromwellian Revolution was a lesson of the same kind.

If even advanced nations find the task of establishing new Constitutions on a permanent basis a hard one, there has hardly been an instance in which they have been successfully framed for any people by foreigners. During the last years of the eighteenth century the Republicans of France deemed it their mission to establish republican institutions in other lands as well as their own. While half a

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1900, by Benjamin H. Whittaker, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

dozen of republican Constitutions were succeeding one another between the monarchy of Louis and the empire of Napoleon, the enthusiasts of liberty were bestowing republican Constitutions on every neighboring land which French armies could penetrate. The Batavian Republic replaced the old States of Holland, the Ligurian the Republic of Genoa, the Parthenopean the Kingdom of Naples, the Cisalpine the Austrian rule in Lombardy. French political experts furnished patent new Constitutions for each, guaranteed truly republican, as readily as they turned out new systems of weights and measures. Within five years they had vanished from the map as suddenly as they appeared.

The Taft Commission seems engaged on a task in the Philippines like that which the French Citizen Commissioners tried so unsuccessfully in Milan and Naples. It is trying to mould the language, religion, schooling, laws, land tenures, methods of taxation and corporate life of a people of eight millions within a few months. It is doing all this, not according to the wishes or wants of that people, but on ideas borrowed from the experience of a community foreign to them in language, race, ideas of government and social life. The Commissioners are not men experienced in administration or acquainted with even the language, much less the character and history of the millions whose destinies they undertake to mould so confidently. Two of them are college professors and three lawyers. Moreover, their task is not to apply the principles of government with which they themselves are familiar, but to devise a new system for Philippine conditions different either from what the Filipinos are used to or Americans use for themselves.

The task would appall most thinking men of conscience, but it seems to offer no difficulty to the learned five. They landed in Manila in June, and in November they confidently inform Secretary Root that they have examined many witnesses and ascertained that the "mass of the people in the islands are ignorant, credulous and childlike," and that the electoral franchise must be much limited because the large majority will not for a long time be capable of intelligently exercising it. The fourteenth amendment embodies the judgment of the American people on the question of keeping the suffrage from the lately emancipated Negroes on grounds of birth, color or previous condition of servitude. The ideas of Messrs. Taft, Worcester and their fellows do not seem in accord with American ideas in that respect. Edmund Burke put on record his inability to frame an indictment against a people of three millions after thirty years of political life. Judge Taft and his colleagues feel quite equal to such a task after six months in office.

In justice it should be said that other Americans have spoken as

disparagingly of the common people in our own land as the Taft Commission speaks of the Filipinos, and even more so. Judge Jay, in the days of John Adams, lamented that the majority of every people were deficient both in virtue and knowledge. Secretary Timothy Pickering held the majority of every people was vicious. Fisher Ames, of Massachusetts, shuddered at the idea of the mere laborers of his State taking share in its government, and declared that the property rights of good men would be subverted in consequence. "Men of sense and property even a little above the multitude," he urged, "wished to keep the government in force enough to govern." Even the immaculate Aaron Burr called for the "union of all good men" to save the young Republic from falling under control of the rabble. These sentiments find echo in the report of the Commission after a lapse of a hundred years. They were then branded as "British" in America. Messrs. Taft and Worcester style them American in the Philippines.

It raises serious thought to find American officials pronouncing the unfitness of the Filipinos to rule themselves after a hundred years of popular sovereignty in these United States. One looks to find what substitute the Commission has to offer as the source of authority in the Philippines for the self-government which alone Americans recognize, and the answer is hardly satisfactory. Military methods of absolutism have been tried and are pronounced unsatisfactory. The Spanish rule has not built up any aristocracy during its three hundred years' existence, strange as that fact seems, considering the tales told of its disregard of native rights. The Commission seems to lean to the rule of a bureaucratic civil service which would be selected and graded solely by merit as tested by competitive examinations. This is the system prevalent in the neighboring Chinese Empire; but even for this the Commissioners see formidable difficulties. It is essential that it be administered with the utmost rigidity and impartiality; but then it must be administered, after all, by men, and the Commissioners pathetically point out that the proportion of Filipinos who can be trusted is quite small. They must be taught by better salaries and by "the example of Americans a different standard of integrity." Unfortunately, we are told the Americans who come to the Philippines do not come as bearers of any moral standards. They come with the idea of making money, and they are exposed, poor fellows, to constant temptations offered by interested persons, who have no other conception of a public officer than that he is to be bribed if his price be known. "Men may leave the United States honest, but with the weakening of home associations and the greed for profit, demoralization and dishonesty are much more likely to follow than at home." Considering that here at home in ordinary

times the proportion of convicts to the population is eight times larger than among the Filipinos under Spanish rule, it makes one anxious to know what the proportion will be when the much greater demoralization and dishonesty are developed among Americans in the Filipinos. Judge Taft's only remedy is to "banish all favoritism and political considerations from the selection of civil servants and to awaken an enthusiasm in the service by reasonable prospects of promotion!" It is satisfactory to note that the danger of favoritism or overgreed for wealth is not considered possible in American Commissioners. The Commission has passed a law which "goes further than any in the United States in carrying out the theory of the merit system." It also commends the "earnest assistance and coöperation of President McKinley and Secretary Root in maintaining pure the civil service of the islands." It is well to know that these high officials, at least, are truly righteous men.

The "qualifications by merit" of the five Commissioners for the highest positions in the government of the Phiilppines are not mentioned in the Report. Judge Taft's are that he is an Ohio lawyer who has filled, in the words of an admirer, more good $6,000 a year positions than any man of his years in that State. Mr. Ide and General Wright are both lawyers well-known in their own States, and that must remove them from all danger of moral weakness. Mr. Dean Worcester was assistant professor of zoölogy in the University of Michigan, and had twice visited the islands before the war. He has also written a book of travel, in which he roundly abused the Catholic priests of the islands. Professor Bernard Moses was unknown to public life outside the University of California when he was called on the recommendation of its new president, Mr. Wheeler, to help in making a Constitution for the Philippines. One can see at a glance how well merited is the tribute paid to President McKinley and his War Secretary for their earnestness to secure the highest standard of fitness in the civil service of the Philippines from these facts.

The Commissioners divided the work of Constitution making among them. It does not appear from the Report that any of them is familiar with the Spanish or native languages or the institutions established in the islands during the last three centuries. Indeed, the English of the report itself seems to need a good deal of improvement both in style and grammar, but that may be passed over. At all events, Judge Taft undertook for his part to provide for a new civil service, a new land system and to deal with the question of the Spanish clergy. Mr. Worcester, as a zoölogist and author, was assigned the regulation of mining laws, forestry, agriculture and public health. He also was set to frame a system of municipal government

to take the place of that already existing in the islands for three centuries. General Wright, of Tennessee, took to himself the questions of organizing a new militia and new police force. He also, as a legal expert, undertook a new criminal code. A new system of public works and the general regulation of franchises were thrown into his share of the Philippine new Constitution. Mr. Ide took on his shoulders the formation of a new civil code and the regulation of courts, registration, banks and currency. To mould the education of the people on new lines was the task assigned to the professor from Berkeley. Incidentally he was directed to frame a new system of general taxation, and to do it pretty quickly, as money was of urgent need in the Philippines. The general problem of organizing the government the Commission kept for its united wisdom.

It had not done much in the latter line when the report was sent to Mr. Root. It took a district of pagan uncivilized tribes in the mountains and called it the province of Benguet. A Governor at $1,500 a year, a secretary at $1,000 and a traveling inspector at $400 were created and named by the Commissions. The native tribes under Spanish rule had been left to manage themselves under their own laws, paying only a poll-tax of twenty-five cents a head and rendering some days' labor on the roads. The chief changes made by the Commission were to have the head men elected annually and to increase the poll-tax to a dollar, with an additional property tax of a half of one per cent. It was further provided that the provincial Governor and secretary should be the majority of an Assessment Board on the hitherto untaxed property of the natives, and his approval should be necessary for all acts of the elected village governments. This method of combining popular elections with an absolute government, independent of their results, is regarded with much satisfaction by the Commission.

The franchise under those conditions might safely be universal, and the Commission so provided in the Igorrote pagan villages. In the civilized towns, however, it is to be limited to those who can read or write Spanish or English or who paid thirty dollars of taxation annually or own property worth five hundred. As the Commission states that it is assured the great mass of the population only speak or write their native languages, this provision secures effectually that none but comparatively wealthy natives shall have a share in municipal governments. The Commission regards this as a very liberal course, and speaks in severe terms of the "cruel oppressions" of the former governments.

Oddly enough, this is contradicted in a long report written by a German resident of Benguet, who says that the "intentions of the government in Madrid, as expressed in the laws, were, on the whole,

just, kind and fatherly. The Madrid government repeatedly issued strict orders to employ towards non-Christian tribes a policy of gentle attraction, and the Igorrotes were left to live in the villages, into which they were gradually drawn from their scattered ranchenas, under headmen of their own race, and with all their peculiar habits not in open contradiction with a gradual advance in civilization." This testimony from a non-Catholic foreign resident to the methods of the government of Spain in the islands is noteworthy. The Commissioners themselves, while freely applying disparaging epithets of a general character to the Spanish administration, furnish several facts which appear incompatible with the existence of real oppression or tyranny. We are informed at page 80 that "before the rebellion in 1896 for many years the Spanish had less than 5,000 peninsular troops in the islands. All the rest were natives. The latter as a rule remained loyal to Spain until it was manifest her sovereignty was ended." The Commission adds, gratuitously: "This was the case, though the masses from whom these native soldiers were drawn were cruelly oppressed by the Spaniards." One would like some more tangible instance of this alleged oppression than the word of the Commissioners before believing its existence, in face of the admitted loyalty of the native troops to their old rulers down to the last.

How sincere the sympathy of at least one of the Commissioners is against oppression of the natives may be judged from the following extract describing a scene in Palawan under Spanish rule: "From the outset our servants stole from us. Finally we missed a box containing twenty-five pounds of gunpowder. . . . We shut Paraiso (one of the servants) into a room and introduced him to the business end of a shotgun at very close range. We told him that *he must choose between* confessing and parting company with his upper story. He at first denied all knowledge of the matter, then admitted he had taken the powder, but said he had forgotten where he had put it. The doctor stimulated his lagging nerve cells by vigorously applying to his person a cleaning rod of good Michigan hickory. This treatment had the desired effect, and we set out to find the powder, the doctor bringing up the rear and occasionally refreshing recollection with the rod." The unfortunate suspect was unable to find the powder even with these stimulants. The writer adds: "We took Paraiso to the headquarters of the guardia and turned him over to the captain, who ordered him whipped. As this failed to produce the desired result, he was afterwards bastinadoed." All was in vain, and the unfortunate native, who had incurred his employer's suspicion, was lodged in prison and left there. We can imagine what would be thought of an employer in this country who, on mere suspicion, would lock up and flog his hired at-

tendant at discretion and threaten him with immediate death unless he recovered property which he had never stolen to all appearance. The parties who perpetrated it in distant Palawan were Dr. Steere, Dr. Brown, late health officer of Manila, and Dean C. Worcester, now one of the Commission entrusted with the task of governing the Philippines on "American principles." The tale is told by himself at page 87 of his work on the Philippine people published in 1898.

The character of the Spanish legislation also finds unexpected testimony in its favor in the report. "The civil code," we are told, "as a system of jurisprudence in its essentials undoubtedly meets the needs of the people of the Philippine Islands and furnishes a just measure of their rights and duties. It is thought that only such changes should be made as are rendered necessary by reason of the changed conditions in passing from the sovereignty of Spain to that of the United States." This statement is not affected by the criticism bestowed on the methods of civil procedure and the numerous delays attributed to the action of the law. Precisely similar criticisms on the "law's delay" are to be found in every American newspaper on the dilatoriness of our own courts. When we are told that "charges of corruption and incompetence against the present Filipino judges are common," we naturally ask are such charges against the judges of our own land unknown? The deduction that "the number of Filipinos fitted by nature, education and moral stability to fill such positions is very small" seems hardly warranted. The report on the administration of justice in the Philippines by Chief Justice Arellano, which fills a large part of the Commission's return, is a document which in fullness and clearness of information stands much above the average of American legal documents. One is inclined to think that the "widespread feeling that these positions must be filled mainly by Americans" is confined to the legal office seekers of the Commission's surroundings in the islands. The part of the report dealing with the rights of the Catholic clergy in the islands and that relating to the proposed system of non-Catholic schools controlled by American agents in independence of the will of the people are of vital importance. The non-interference of the General Government in matters of religion is a part of the Constitution for over a century. It is the chief boon that Catholics can receive from a non-Catholic State, and they cannot afford to see it disregarded in the islands which have become a part of the American domain. Judge Taft in that part of the report which he claims as his own shows no scruples about subordinating the rights of conscience to political ends of other kinds. The question was presented to him whether the Spanish priests, who formed nearly two-thirds of the clergy of the country at the time of the American invasion

and had been driven from their parishes by the insurgent leaders, would be allowed to return to their posts and provide for the spiritual wants of their people. The right to do so had been guaranteed to them on the public faith of the United States by the treaty of cession from Spain. Its exercise has been refused since by the will of the generals, whose absolute authority has been the representative of American government in the Philippines. The Taft Commission having announced its mission to establish a civil government of some kind, the representatives of the Catholic Church asked that freedom of sending priests to the Catholic populations at their own risk should be given them, as required by the treaty. The answer of Judge Taft, while avoiding any positive statement, virtually denied this right in terms which do no credit either to his intelligence as a Judge or his ideas of tolerance for Catholics. We shall examine his own words.

For the sake of clearness we shall first deal with his views on the right of Catholic priests if members of certain religious orders to exercise their functions among those of their communion in the islands. We pass over the question of their property rights and Judge Taft's personal ideas of their morality, which he ventilates at length in the manner familiar to anti-Catholic lecturers, though, as he says, quite "irrelevant to the point."

"Ordinarily," Judge Taft writes to the Secretary of War, "the Government of the United States, or its servants, have little or no concern with religious societies. *With us* the Church is so completely separated from the State that it is difficult to imagine cases in which the policy of a Church in the selection of its ministers and their assignments to duty can be regarded as of political moment or as proper subject of comment in the report of a public officer. *In the pacification of the Phillipines*, however, it is impossible to ignore the very great part which such a question plays. Except the Moros and the wild tribes, the Philippine people belong to the Roman Catholic Church. The total of the Catholic souls shown by church registers in 1898 was six millions five hundred and fifty-nine thousand nine hundred."

The distinction drawn between the American Government "with us" and "in the Philippines" is very significant. It is emphasized by the explanation that the Filipino people are not entitled to the same non-interference with their religion as "with us," because "they are all Catholics." Does the Judge hold Catholics specially liable to have the selection of their priests considered of political moment and proper subject of comment by public officers, while such interference is unimaginable in the case of any other religion? It might be recalled, too, that the non-interference of Congress or Govern-

ment in such matters is not merely a matter of ordinary custom, but distinctly prohibited by the Constitution which he and his superiors are sworn to maintain. We proceed to the further statement of the particular case in Judge Taft's words:

"By the revolutions of 1896 and 1898 against Spain all the Dominicans, Augustinians, Recollects and Franciscans acting as parish priests were driven to take refuge in Manila. Forty were killed and four hundred and three imprisoned and not released until, by the advance of the American troops, it became impossible for the insurgents to hold them. Of the 1,124 in the islands in 1896 but 474 remain. *The remainder were either killed or died, returned to Spain or went to China* or South America. The burning question which strongly agitates the people of the Philippines is whether the members of four orders shall return to the parishes from which they were driven by the revolutionists. . . . The commissioner to whom the subject was assigned (Taft) was enabled, by the courtesy of Archbishop Chapelle, to take the statements of the Archbishop of Manila, the Bishops of Vigan and Jaro and of the provincials of all the orders resident in Manila. The questions asked covered all the charges which have been made against the friars, the feeling of the people towards them, the extent of their property and the possibility (sic) of their return to their parishes. Other witnesses, Philippine laymen, army officers, American Catholic priests and newspaper correspondents, were examined in great numbers, though all their statements could not be reduced to writing."

One notes as peculiar in a judicial investigation that while the claimants of the friars' rights are all definite persons and described by Judge Taft as "all educated gentlemen of high moral standards," the other "witnesses" are all anonymous. Of the four classes called, three could have no personal knowledge of any facts relating to the relations of the friars with their parishioners before their violent expulsion or to their characters. They could give nothing but hearsay gossip on these subjects, and even this the Judge did not deem it needful to have written down. As to the qualifications of "Philippine laymen" in that quality alone, to give trustworthy evidence, it would seem to need some further explanation with six and a half millions of persons entitled to the name. Of the Filipinos connected with the American civil service, the report says, at page 20, "the percentage who can be trusted to handle public money or exercise control over their fellow-residents without peculation is comparatively small." Of the people at large it says, two pages earlier: "The difficulty they have in communicating with the Americans because of a want of knowledge of their language, character or customs would tend to make them silent in any event, and when this is ac-

companied by the very present prospect of being abducted, boloed (sic) or tortured, it is not remarkable that the insurgents are able to assume the rôle of amigos (friends) when pressed." It would add to the value of the unwritten statements of the numerous Philippine laymen if we knew whether they belonged to the class that cannot be trusted to handle public money or to the much larger one which dare not speak truth through fear of assassination by the very revolutionists who had expelled the friars and murdered so many of them. How could even a Judge know under the circumstances how far the matter at stake was really a burning question among a people whom his Commission describes as absolutely terrorized? What "army officers" would have to say in the matter as their opinion passes comprehension. Of the class described as American Catholic priests, there were not over four, we believe, in Manila, and at page 16, speaking of the evidence of one of them on another point, the Commission thinks it "probably erroneous." No oaths were administered in any case, nor, as it would appear later, was any attempt made to compare the statements made, largely in language foreign to the Judge, with public documents in possession of the Commission. The naïveté of a Judge when applied to for permission to return to certain places gravely asking the general public whether it was possible to return is remarkable in legal practice. We freely assert that no similar trial of the rights of several hundred clergymen to exercise the functions of their office, as secured to them by the national honor, can be found in the history of civilized nations. Judge Taft's own description of it when he calmly says, "We have attempted without bias to reach a conclusion as to the truth and shall now state it," hardly commands the belief of fair-minded men.

Having described the case to be tried and the methods adopted for its examination, the Judge goes on to give Secretary Root, and through him, Congress and the American people his own judgment on the friars. The case placed before him as ruler of the islands was, in fact, a demand on the part of the latter for the right to return to their parishes, of which they had been arbitrarily deprived by the Military Governor. The Judge gave no decision, which practically left the applicants without their rights. By way of compensation he has laid before Mr. Root the conclusions formed by himself on the expediency of getting them out of the Philippines either by threats or promises. Of their undoubted right to remain under the treaty, the only mention anywhere made is this: "If the friars return to their parishes, though only under the same police protection which the American Government *is bound to extend to any other* Spanish subjects commorant (sic) in the islands, the people will regard it as the act of the Government. It is likely to have the same

effect on them that *the return of General Weyler as Governor of Cuba under an American commission would have had* on the people of that island." This what Mr. Taft considers stating the truth without bias most men will regard as a specimen of partisan special pleading of a peculiarly low kind.

The inconvenient treaty rights of the friars having been thus dismissed, the Judge goes on to give the opinions he has formed from his numerous informants. The only authority, besides his own, given for them is a statement said to be by the Franciscan provincial, but which, on the face of it, has been wilfully or ignorantly garbled into nonsense. Perhaps we should add the novel of Dr. Rizal of some years ago, which is gravely quoted as evidence, though we venture to say it has not been read by the man who quotes it. The Spanish friars having asked the Commission as official American authority for the rights guaranteed them by the American Government, the head of the Commission sees fit to give to the Secretary of War his own opinion of Spanish friars in general. It is, of course, drawn from hearsay entirely of the "witnesses" just described, officers, correspondents, etc.

The friar, as a parish priest, was usually the only man of intelligence and education who knew the native dialect and the Spanish language well in his parish. His position as spiritual guide of the people *necessarily led* to his acting as intermediary between them and the rest of the world in secular matters. At first actually, and afterwards by law, he came to discharge many civil functions and to supervise or veto everything which was done in the pueblo which was his parish. The provincial of the Franciscans describes his civil functions as follows:

He was inspector of primary schools, president of the Health Board and Board of Charities, of the Board of Urban Taxation, Inspector of Taxation, president of the Board of Public Works. He was president of the Board of Statistics. It was against the will of the priest to do this, but he could only do as he was told. They did not have civil registration here, and so they had to depend on the books of the parish. These books were sent in for the cedula taxation (income tax), but were not received by the authorities unless vised by the priest.

He was president of the census taking of the town. He had to be present by law when there were municipal elections. Very often he did not want to go, but the people would come to him and say: "Come, for there will be disturbances, and you will settle many difficulties." He was censor of the municipal budgets, president of the Prison Board and inspector of the food provided for the prisoners. He was a member of the Provincial Board. Before it came all mat-

ters relating to public works. He was also member of the board for partitioning crown lands. After the land was surveyed and divided and a man wanted to sell his land he would present his certificate and the board would decide whether or not he was the owner. He was also counsellor for the municipal body when it met. The priest was supervisor of election of the police force. He was the censor of plays, comedies and dramas in the native language, deciding whether they were conformable to law and morality. These plays were acted at the popular fiestas. Besides there were other small things which devolved on the priest.

Judge Taft concludes confidently: "It is easy to see from this that the priest was not only the spiritual guide, but in every sense the municipal ruler." He goes on to heighten the picture so worked up from the words of the unsuspecting Spanish provincial: "To the Filipino the government in these islands under Spain was the government of the friars. Every abuse of the many which led to the revolutions of 1896 and 1898 was charged by *the people* to the friars. Whether they were in fact to blame is, perhaps, aside from our purpose, but it *cannot admit of contradiction* that the autocratic power which each friar curate exercised over the people and civil officials gave them a most plausible ground for belief that nothing of injustice, of cruelty, of oppression was imposed on them for which the friars were not directly responsible. The revolutions against Spain's authority began as movements against the friars. Such was the tendency of Rizal's chief work, the novel 'Noli me Tangere.' The treaty of Biacnabato, which ended the first revolution, *is said* to have contained the condition that the friars should be expelled. In the second revolution (Aguinaldo's) at least forty friars were killed and over four hundred imprisoned. In view of these circumstances the statement of the Bishops and friars that the mass of the population are friendly to them, except only a few leading men in each town and the native clergy, cannot be accepted as accurate. All the evidence derived from every source" (tapped by Judge Taft), "except the friars, shows that the feeling of hatred for them is well nigh universal and permeates all classes."

Let us examine these assertions to see how far Judge Taft's judgment deserves to be regarded as a truthful statement of facts. It was probably true that the friar parish priests were usually the most intelligent persons in their parishes, and as such extensively consulted in the worldly concerns of the natives whom their predecessors had civilized. This will hardly be held a crime deserving expulsion. The good Franciscan provincial apparently tried to explain this state of things to the man whom he regarded as the friendly and conscientious representative of American rule. The grotesque garbling of

his words which Mr. Taft presents to the American public speaks its falsehood in terms plain to any comprehension. Does he really believe that the Tagal and Visaya villages were equipped with the Boards of Health, charities, prisons, statistics, census, local police, crown lands, general taxation, urban taxation, police and elections, with the presidency of which he tells us the terrible friar priests were universally invested? If there were no such boards, and a glance at the Spanish records under his hand would show him they had no existence, why does he not say so when pretending to give the testimony of the Franciscan provincial? As a matter of fact, the official position of the parish priest was simply that of a member of the local village council. In the sketch of the Spanish administration by Chief Justice Arrelano, which forms a part of the report, we are told at page 231 that the local chiefs, known as Gobernadorcillos, assumed the exercise of both executive and judicial functions within their sphere of action. If Judge Taft had desired information on the accuracy of the wonderful Pooh Bah functions which he says the Franciscan provincial laid before him, could he not have applied for information to the learned Justice. If there was no civil regulation and no police force, what would be the functions of Boards of Statistics, Census and Police? The urban taxation of the whole archipelago, the report tells, reached only a hundred and forty thousand dollars, nearly all paid in three cities. What would boards for collecting it have to do among Indian huts? These questions would occur to any man of sense. They either did not occur to Judge Taft or he preferred not to make them that he might build up an indictment of autocratic powers against the friars on false evidence. If these had no existence, there would be no plausibility in the belief that the friars were responsible for everything of injustice, of cruelty and oppression that a lurid imagination could suggest and which the unbiased Judge cautiously hints are good reason for violation of the treaty obligations of the United States.

Strong as this language seems, it is scarcely as strong as deserved. When a Judge tells us that a treaty made five years ago "is said" to have promised to expel the friars, why does he not find whether it exists or not? He confidently declares that the murder of forty friars and the expulsion of the others by the violence of Aguinaldo's revolutionary following proves conclusively, against the statement of the friars themselves, that the mass of the people cannot be friendly to them and that hatred to the friars is well nigh universal. The same Judge on page 17 explains why murders of police officers in the American service are no proof of ill will to the American government. He says in this case:

"From all the information we can get it seems clear that a great

majority of the people are for peace and willing to accept the establishment of a government under the supremacy of the United States. They are, however, restrained by fear from taking action to assist in the suppression of the insurrection, which has for its indispensable support a conspiracy of murder. Any one suspected of giving information to the Americans is immediately marked for assassination. The ramifications of the conspiracy are so wide that it has effected the terrorism of an entire people. It is a Mafia on a very large scale." Page 17.

Judge Taft within thirteen pages asks us to believe this as the explanation of native hostility to Americans and scouts it as unworthy of credence when made by the whole body of Catholic Bishops and provincials as the explanation of the hostility to the friars. The insurgents now in arms are precisely the same organization that murdered forty friars and imprisoned four hundred in 1898. Does a Mafia cease to be criminal when its victims are unarmed priests whose crime is that they were usually the only men of intelligence and education in the native villages?

We must come to the conclusions drawn by the Chief Commissioner from the evidence just examined. He says: "We are convinced that the return of the friars to their parishes will lead to lawless violence and murder, and that the people will charge the course taken to the American Government, thus turning against it the resentment felt towards the friars. We earnestly hope that those who control the policy of the Catholic Church in these islands will see that it would be most unfortunate for the Philippine Islands for the Catholic Church and for the American Government to send back the friars. The question for the prelate and statesman is not whether the bitter feeling towards the friars *is justified or not*, but whether it exists. It does not seem to us, therefore, to aid in reaching a conclusion to *point out that all the civilization found* in the Philippines *is due to the friars. Be it so.* Ought they, on this account, to return to their parishes in the face of deep popular feeling against them? It is enough to say *the political question* will be eliminated if the friars are not sent back."

What political question the Judge means is not clear. He can hardly mean the whole opposition of the people to the American rule, though most readers will so take it. That opposition has been conducted, he tells us, by a "Mafia on a large scale," directed by the same parties who murdered or drove away the friars. If he means nothing but the political question of providing the same police protection for the friars as for other residents, it may certainly be true; but that means no more than saying if there were no friars to deal with it would not be necessary to deal with them. The higher po-

litical question, whether the United States Government can honorably break its solemn treaty obligations, will remain still and cannot be evaded.

It is evident that the Commission is most anxious to deport all the friars, if it possibly can, as Captain Leary deported the Franciscans from Guam a few months ago. The Protestant prejudices of the Commissioners, which in the case of Mr. Worcester are shown sufficiently in his book and in Judge Taft's by his report, may keep them from seeing the consequences involved, but to any intelligent Catholic or clear-sighted impartial man they must be obvious. The expulsion of the Spanish friars means that five millions of Filipino Catholics must be left without priests, sacraments or religious instruction for at least a generation. There are less than seven hundred native priests for seven millions of a Catholic population, and there are no other priests, either American or European, familiar with Filipino language or customs except these friars. They and they alone have given the people the civilization it possesses, as Judge Taft himself admits. They possess seminaries, formed on the experience of ten generations, for training a clergy to the special needs of this body of Asiatic Christians which in many points has nothing similar to it in the world outside. The people, as he also admits, love the Catholic Church. Indeed, he doubts whether there is any country in the world in which the people have a more profound attachment for their church. It "is and ought to continue a prominent factor in the life, peace, contentment and progress of the Filipino people. As to use of intoxicating liquors, drunkenness and disorder, Manila's condition is better than any American city of the same size." This is Judge Taft's testimony to the result of the moral teaching of the men whom he is so anxious to expel lest the United States Government should incur the resentment of the people. His own deduction from it is an unconscious piece of humor worthy of Dogberry itself. "The depth of their feeling against the friars (as gathered from army officers, newspaper correspondents and hostile natives) may be measured by the fact that it exists against those who until two years ago administered the sacraments of the Church upon which they feel so great a dependence and for which they have so profound a respect." Might not the feeling be accounted for by "the terrorism of an entire people" which he also finds existing when explaining the duration of the war against American rule? From whom but the friars have they learned this profound respect for the Church?

The elaborate plan imposing a compulsory school system moulded on "non-sectarian" lines on the Catholics of the islands gives further reason to believe that the rooting out of the Catholic religion is a

prominent object with the Commission. Mr. Moses, who, we are informed, is a Swede and familiar with the system of intolerance of Catholics still prevailing in Sweden, has been charged with the task of providing schools for the people whom Judge Taft would leave without priests. As a help this foreign pedagogue has been allowed to regulate the whole system of taxation, as if schools of a new pattern were the central principle of administration. A land tax is to be imposed to meet the general public wants. Twenty-five cents on the dollar is made imperative on the native villages whenever they shall receive the municipal rights which they have hitherto enjoyed under the oppressive Spanish Government. That sum has to be handed over to the School Commissioners, who, by the plan of Mr. Moses, are to be wholly independent of local control and, in fact, to be wholly Americans as far as the higher posts are concerned. It is significant that while in the organization of the first province established by the Commission the election of "ecclesiastics" by the people is prohibited, we learn by California papers that a newly ordained Baptist minister, the Rev. Mr. Brink, has been invited to "take charge of the public schools of one of the large islands." The reverend gentleman's only qualification, as far as known, consists in his being a Baptist clergyman. His case is but one of others already spoken of in the press. The report mentions that "General Otis wished military officers to open as many schools as possible, and that several of the district commanders appointed officers to act as superintendents of schools. Among these are several *army chaplains*. To put Protestant ministers in the place of Catholic friars seems the dream of Judge Taft.

How far the ideas go of the professor who has been suddenly called to mould the whole education of the Filipinos may be gathered from his own words:

"Under Spanish rule there was established a system of primary schools. In these reading, writing, sacred history and the catechism were taught, the four arithmetical processes were attempted, and in a few towns a book of geography was used as a reading book. Girls were taught embroidery and needlework. In the typical provincial school at first a religious primer was used in *the native* language, and later a book on Christian doctrine was taught. The *text-books were crude and provided a large amount of religious instruction.* It has been stated there were in the islands 2,167 public schools. *The ineffectiveness of these schools* will be seen when it is remembered that school under the Spanish régime was a *strictly sectarian* ungraded school."

The propriety of this language in a wholly Catholic country speaks for itself. In the eye of Mr. Moses "religious instruction" is appar-

ently incompatible with effective teaching and Catholicity identical with sectarianism.

His own scholastic methods, as told in the report, are, if not crude, certainly remarkable. His chief authorities seem to be army officers. He tells us that though the employment of soldiers as teachers has not been always successful, and that the schools that have been established by them are poor, still the "commanding officers" are unanimous in urging English instruction and *asking for English teachers.* One brilliant officer named Echols, a captain in the army, assured him of a strange thing that "to teach English to the natives a knowledge of Spanish or Tagal is not necessary." One involuntarily thinks of the experience of young Primrose in the "Vicar of Wakefield" when he went to Holland to teach English and found some acquaintance with Dutch indispensable. The remarkable officer, however, declares that he himself at one time had charge of four thousand American Indians with six boarding schools, and that not a child could speak a word of English, and *in three months they learned it fairly well.* And this was accomplished by teachers utterly unfamiliar with the native dialects. The captain's statement deserves the verdict once passed on Gulliver's travels. Some things stated in it go to the very bounds of credulity.

It seems to be accepted with implicit faith by good Professor Moses, who went on to consult with "military officers, presidentes and other" educational experts to ascertain the exact educational situation and the general opinion as to the educational policy to be pursued. It is sad to learn he discovered a "great diversity of opinion," but anyhow he appointed a Dr. Atkinson general superintendent of education and put out his own programme. "It is not practical," he says, "to make the native languages the basis of instruction, *for this would necessitate the translation of many texts* into the native dialects." Most of his authorities, the "commanding officers," state that no instruction in native languages is desirable and also that there is no need of perpetuating Spanish. This comfortable, if hardly practical, theory of educating a people in a language unknown to them enables the professor to find a large field of employment for teacher friends at home who would find a knowledge of any tongue but their own a task beyond their powers. He sums up:

"The system of instruction must be largely centralized. There will be a general superintendent of education and as many assistant superintendents as there are departments. There will be a system of *local advisory boards.*

"All schools must be free and unsectarian.

"The text-books and *English teachers* will have to be furnished to

municipalities by the insular government (the superintendent aforesaid).

"The present educational system will have to be modernized and *secularized* and adapted to the *needs* of a people who have hitherto been *deprived of the opportunities of a rational education.*"

Though Professor Moses can accept Captain Echols' narrative without scruple we learn he regards Catholic teaching as *not rational!* His emphatic order, after six months in public office, that Philippine schools "must be free and unsectarian" is suggestive of Kaiser William's language to his soldiers. Yet the Commission is supposed to be remodelling the Filipinos on "American ideas." They may be so in the sense that such ideas are entertained by some American individuals as in former times they were by Burr and Benedict Arnold, but not otherwise.

Any person familiar with the history of the English penal code and the attempts made by some English politicians to draw the Irish people from their faith by means of the public schools cannot but be struck by their likeness to the methods suggested by Professor Moses. The municipalities must have no voice in the matter and the schools must be entirely controlled by the irresponsible agents of the government at Washington. In like manner the national education of Ireland was handed over in 1839 to the control of a Presbyterian minister, and it was claimed as unparalleled liberality, after the lapse of several years, that two nominal Catholics were allowed places in a board of seven.

The exclusion of Catholic instruction from the Irish schools was required, as it is by Mr. Moses in the Filipino schools. The ignoring of the native languages might have been taken bodily from the English school legislation in Ireland. The Commission does not go quite so far as to make it a felony for a Catholic to teach school, but the spirit which describes Catholic schools is incapable of giving a rational education is the same as that which moulded English legislation. The will shown by the whole body to expel the only available Catholic priests as "Spanish friars" is exactly parallel to the policy which prohibited the landing of seminary priests or Jesuits in British territory as treason and which sent Campion and Southwell to the gallows, "not as priests, but as traitors to the Queen's majesty." In like manner Judge Taft dwells effusively on his respect for Catholicity in America and praises the sagacity of the Catholic Church authorities while he throws out his low appeals to popular prejudice here against the Philippine clergy as Spanish friars and is not ashamed to drag in the name of General Weyler to help in the misrepresentation. How far his professions in this respect merit confidence may be judged by the garbled absurdities which he under-

takes to pass on the American public as the words of the Franciscan provincial. That should be a warning to all Catholics who may be tempted to put faith in the professions of good will of Messrs. Taft, Worcester and Moses. Indeed, the nomination of the second named, after the publication of his book, should be ample notice that to the present administration hostility to Catholic priests and teachings is sufficient qualification for office in the Philippines.

We may add as another parallel that the system which the Commission favors has a close resemblance to that which the American missionaries set up in Hawaii. Compulsory education on American ideas, a civil service filled by foreigners on foreign tests of fitness, the turning over the public lands to foreign capitalists and general reprobation of the former laws and customs of the native people are all conspicuous in the reports of the missionary agents to the American Board of Missions. They are all to be found in the report of the Taft Commission to Congress. The missionary Constitution makers had their way in Hawaii, and within seventy years the native population has well nigh melted out of existence under their enlightened methods. Fathers Bachelot and Short were deported from Hawaii in 1830, as Mr. Taft would like to deport the Spanish friars from the Philippines to-day and as Captain Leary has already done in Guam. How far does the experience of the Hawaiian people justify the expectation that Judge Taft's Constitution will raise the condition of the seven millions of the Filipino population? Catholics in America are certainly bound in duty to see that the religious liberty of the Filipinos is not trampled under foot in the name of American legislation. That the Commission has no scruples about attempting the task seems abundantly evident from their own report.

BRYAN J. CLINCH.

San Francisco, Cal.

SPENCER'S PHILOSOPHY.

MR. SPENCER has undertaken to prove by what he calls the Synthetic Philosophy a cosmical evolution embracing all things but the Absolute Reality. The latter is the sole reality; all other existences are relative, not even contingent. We fail to find a use for the Absolute Reality, for Mr. Spencer gives him no place in morality; he lies as a darkness on the face of the deep, the negation of light, intelligence and power; and yet he is the sum of physical and mental phenomena. He is an eternal nothing, an

impotent omnipotence, an infinite contradiction. Justly does Mr. Spencer speak of him as "unknowable," for he is "unthinkable."

We extract the five great issues which Mr. Spencer seeks to establish:

1. That there was no external agency in the change from matter without motion to matter in motion; which is his first assumption with regard to cosmical evolution.

2. That there was no external agency in the change from the inorganic to the organic.

3. That there was no external agency in the change from the nonsentient to the sentient.

4. That there was no external agency in evolving the highest consciousness from the lowest forms of animal life;[1] assuming that the change was wrought by a process describable as evolution.

5. That all intellectual activities are expressible and solely expressible in terms of matter and motion as part of the universal movement from homogeneity to heterogeneity.

We do not purpose expressing our own opinion on any of the issues raised—that they include the whole philosophy of Mr. Spencer no one can question—we shall, possibly, avoid the declaration of our opinion on the innumerable subordinate points which are employed as media of proof, make-weights to the media, or matters in confirmation of the issues—or, to put this last in another way, as suggested verifications of the issues. Our course shall be to ascertain whether he establishes the issues. If he fails in any one of them, his theory has broken down. He gives this challenge when he holds that consequences are not the test of a theory; that the coherence and consistency of the thoughts is the standard by which a system of philosophy is to be judged; that this is the measure of truth where knowledge is conditioned as ours is to the merely relative, that is, where it is limited to the perception of relations and the relations between relations.

To illustrate the method we are employing we take the last issue: Thought is to be expressed in terms of matter and motion, if his theory of evolution be true. His corrected formula of evolution is that it comes about by "an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion, during which the matter passes from an indefinite incoherent homogeneity to a definite coherent heterogeneity and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation." Is this a law of intellectual activities? Does it in any way fit the facts from the stimulation of the nerve to the sensation and thence to the record in consciousness of the landscape before the eye? Where is the integration of matter there and concomitant

[1] He speaks of sub-vital organisms, but this is meaningless.

dissipation of motion? Assuming that the nerve is stimulated by the oscillation of molecules, how is their homogeneity converted into the heterogeneity of the mental picture? We cannot conceive it as an explanation at all of the fact that we have the reproduction of the landscape in consciousness, and the belief that what is in the consciousness corresponds with something external. Matter in the formula of evolution is the vehicle of motion as in the initial change at which evolution begins. If the law of evolution be correctly stated, and if it be that mind and its processes are governed by that law, a tune that starts various associations and the associations themselves are the parallel transformation of the retained motion of the vibrations proceeding from the piano or violin. We have no connection between the performer's thought passing through the instrument to the hearer's consciousness and evoking the latter's sympathy with the other's tenderness, passion, art, expressing themselves by touches and muscular exertion. All that the touches and the muscular activities could reveal—assuming bare consciousness of them in performer and listener—would be some mode of resistance to the first and a succession of identical sounds to the latter. In other words, the sense of hearing would only convey homogeneity of sound plus difference of intensity in the impression on the auditory nerve; while the performer could only connect the resistance with a certain noise or a series of noises. Even to make this possible an enormous assumption must be made—namely, the evolution from the unconscious to the conscious, from the non-vital to the vital. If mind and its processes could be expressed in terms of matter and motion we must first assume a sort of consciousness—a recording relation between the mind and the senses; but it would still appear that a whole series of assumptions should be made. We should assume the vibration of molecules is convertible into the power of ordering, shaping, creating, reviewing, judging, inferring, commanding with authority, punishing with justice, and so on, by some modification of motion—modifying nerve stimuli.[2] The retardation of motion generates heat, but how can it be converted into the categorical imperative? or how can intensified vibration of molecules give us the idea of a God or a sense of the necessity of some polity for the successful life of man? Matter and motion are the sufficing terms to express all the activities of mind. We cannot conceive the discovery of a mathematical truth in no way dependent on laws of matter or motion as expressible in these terms. If there were no matter, no motion, the three angles of a triangle would be equal to two right angles. We cannot conceive a pure intelligence

[2] We here allowed the assumption of consciousness of nerve stimuli to put Mr. Spencer's formula in the fairest way for application.

thinking of any relation but that of equality between them. In the demonstration leading to that conclusion man, who is not a pure intelligence, has no conception of matter and of motion before him. The imagination which conceives the weakness of Macbeth yielding to temptation and the tragic terror of his remorse afterwards cannot be described as an indefinite incoherent homogeneity passing to a definite coherent heterogeneity by the transformation of one mode of force into another, as, say, of heat into electricity. Mr. Spencer's theory is a rigidly mechanical view[3] of nature's processes in the orders of mind and matter—and he is quite consistent, quite coherent in maintaining that mind can be expressed by the terms of a mechanical force—but we require him to prove that it can be so expressed.

On his initial assumption there was a period when indefinite incoherent homogeneity was the only existence, the only fact. It is very difficult to make out what he has in view. He assumes a strictly limited homogeneity—he must do this if motion is afterwards to appear on the scene—but though he rejects the notion of eternal matter, we find the homogeneity not a blot on the azure, not tendrils of "mind stuff" swaying in limpid depths indeed, but a something occupying space before anything began to bring about the movement now progressing or retrogressing throughout what Mr. Carlyle would call the infinities.

We must pause a moment to ask the ground for the assumptions that matter is not eternal, that there is a vacuum. He asserts its infinite divisibility; why not its infinite duration? The mind fails to put a limit to its divisibility, he says; on the same principle it must fail to put a limit on its duration. How can he assume on the principle of infinite divisibility a limited extension? Motion must have room; therefore there are unoccupied spaces. This is hardly sufficient, unless he confounds unresisting matter with solid bodies —and this we think he does, for from solid body we derive the primordial and universal concept, which expresses all other concepts, and which no other concept expresses—namely, resistance. Mr. Huxley is too jaunty in approving of Mr. Spencer's conception of evolution as not troubling the mind about theories of creation. First, his hypothesis tries to evade a difficulty; surely that would not be a solution. But does it evade the difficulty when it involves him in assumptions more difficult to conceive than the "unthinkable" positions of the creative theory?

First Mr. Spencer posits matter; where does he get it? From

[3] The theory of creation used to be described by the skeptics as a mechanical system; they meant artificial. Mr. Spencer compares the conception to a carpenter fashioning his wood into a chair or table, that is, if there had been preëxistent material.

rather vague hints we judge it to be molecules in ether, but whatever it is, it is in a condition of unstable equilibrium. What held the balance? What, in the absence of force or motion, caused the molecules to tremble like magnetic needles? These molecules are not said to be animated, but there is a reference to the cell of embryology. This inference may contain, if not all the potentialities of terrestrial life, a loophole for Mr. Spencer. The important point here, however, is that the hypothesis demands a period of immobility, that is, the period before change. Matter only existed, setting aside the Absolute Reality; though there was no consciousness, he existed—eternity without a consciousness! he is only an ornamental excrescence, at this stage at least. He may in some future work of this philosopher figure as a *Deus ex machina*, for Mr. Spencer is fertile in expedients, but how matter in equilibrium got there is another thing. It, and it alone, existed until "change" entered on the scene. From that entrance we have the transforming process of the indefinite, incoherent homogeneity into the earth and its living things, the countless solar systems and into the activities now working changes, the universe towards completed progress, equilibration and dissolution. It must be understood that evolution means all this.

It would certainly be more satisfactory if Mr. Spencer told us what he means by the indefinite, incoherent homogeneity. He was very angry with Mr. Kirkman and Professor Tait for their criticism on the formula of evolution; but these gentlemen could have been spared his indignation. They did not hit the blot in the formula. No doubt the words are pedantic, long-tailed, charlatanish words, in our poor opinion; but if they convey definite conceptions, what more is to be said?[4] Our complaint is not that the words are Anglicized Greek and Latin; we are tolerant; we see such words every day in quacks' advertisements, dentists' advertisements, barbers' advertisements and the advertisements of the professors of such arts generally. What we complain of is that the formula as it stands is either nonsense or it rests on assumptions impossible of proof. We said we would not give our own opinion, that is, that we would only examine the validity of Mr. Spencer's positions. Well, then, instead of "assumptions impossible of proof" let us say assumptions that have not yet been proved or attempted to be proved.

We are reminded of the gambler's method of securing himself by "hedging;" he is pretty safe on either issue, of course, but he makes his haul on one. No one has remarked that Mr. Spencer hedges on

[4] Mr. Spencer's style is a great instrument for all we say above. He has had unparalleled influence on the thought of England, America and the Continent of Europe. We may have to show how it aided the predisposition to scientific atheism prevailing in progressive circles.

the evolution formula coupled with the appeal to the differentiation in the plasm as it evolves. If he be reminded that the early processes of evolution were purely physical, and yet from these life must have emerged, he can turn round and say: Look at my cell; look how it differentiates, becomes complex, as embryology shows you. On the other hand, if he be charged with slyly assuming animal vitality and a mind in matter conscious or unconscious,[5] he raises his eyebrows, metaphorically, of course, smiles at your simplicity which takes an illustration for a scientific theory. Verily, the science men of this world are wiser in their generation, etc.!

The entire agnostic school insist that the hypothesis of evolution must be taken as established in its widest sense. There are differences as to the recognition to be allowed to the linking of stages, but the resolution of mind into a physiological phenomenon is accepted. We want to have this last point proved. Mr. Spencer makes us only a relation, not even a contingent being; we have no existence except as a relation, that is, in relation to some other existence, namely, the Absolute Reality. We are an appearance, nothing more; the Absolute Reality, without conscience or consciousness, is the sole existence. But let him allow us a right to doubt him, at least provisionally, though we may not claim to exist because we doubt. There are some differences in the school respecting the method of "becoming,"[6] but these may be said to be matters of detail. Still the details have their value. Do they not include differences in the nature or the properties of that which "began to become," the esse? At any rate, the doctrine of evolution applies to all phenomena without exception, that is, to all mental as well as physical phenomena.

Mr. Huxley sometimes plays the part of candid friend of evolution, but he can at times be very thoroughgoing. He was so in the dialectical gymnastics exhibited when scornfully and savagely attacking the opponents of the doctrine of evolution because they argue, he said, for the most part from the etymology of the word. It must be borne in mind that with Mr. Spencer we are dealing with universal evolution. Darwin's cattle-breeding is not in the play at all. Instead of unfolding, Mr. Huxley insists that Mr. Spencer's interpretation of growing complexity is the true one. How does that alter the case? Complexity is Mr. Spencer's shibboleth, certainly. Complexity is evolution and evolution is complexity; but we have complexity followed by equilibrium, which is the highest complexity, and this is to be succeeded by disintegration—a return to simplicity or, in his own term, homogeneity. At all events,

[5] We should not be surprised if the Absolute Reality were projected as a bait to swallow the hypothesis of a world soul. Romanes took it, hook and all. [6] Feari.

whether or not "unfolding" can take place, it is of the very essence of the hypothesis to formulate continuity of growth. The popularity of the doctrine was due to some extent to its promise of progress to perfection, due to a larger extent to the moral irresponsibility it implied. If greater complexity meant greater virtue in the social body, and if the social body's interaction generated morality, the many-sided, diplomatically-minded man was the righteous man. Violate the ten commandments, but do so in a gentleman-like, well-bred manner, or, as Iago would say, put money in thy purse.

Continuity of growth must have been as distinctly in the mind of the objectors assailed by Mr. Huxley as a process of unfolding. Change would be open to objection as employed by Mr. Spencer—for, after all, we are entitled on their own principles to look at succession of phenomena—but what we want is their proof that the succession of phenomena, beginning with and including the "change" from the indefinite homogeneity, can be explained by physical laws alone. If this cannot be done, what is the value of the hypothesis? The Synthetic Philosophy professes to accomplish this. We shall see. One issue may be hurt already.

The keynote of Mr. Spencer's argument is the identity of all mental processes. This is the burden of his *Psychology*. If he can establish this thesis he considers he has advanced a great step towards including mental phenomena in the Law of the Correlation of Forces. He would still have to bridge the chasm between not-life and life, but he is on his way to unification of the mental and physical orders. There is no difference, according to him, between an impression on the senses not adverted to or hardly adverted to and self-consciousness. He admits, no doubt, as we shall have to mention later on, that there is "a vast difference" between the modes of consciousness of an animal with a life apparently one remove from vegetable life and the modes of consciousness in the higher organisms; but a sensation hardly awaking response is in its nature, he says, the same as the highest exertion of what is called intellect. The difference between the modes of consciousness in a rudimentary organism and in ourselves would appear fatal to his theory. We are not pressing that; what we rather complain of is the confusion of an issue. All mental life is identical; its processes vary in degree. The suggestion is that sensations hardly noticed stand at the foot of the expansion of the human mind and correspond with the modes of consciousness of rudimentary organisms. The admission that man's consciousness has fuller revelations than the actinia's, or of some animal even more differentiated, though very low in the scale, is unavoidable. If he said anything else he would make himself ridiculous. The modes of man's consciousness are different from

those of the lower organism, but what we complain of is the issue suggested—that a sensation hardly evoking a response in man is identical with the consciousness or feeling of the rudimentary organism.

If there be no difference between impressions on the senses hardly noticed and self-consciousness, between a feeling and the intuition of a truth save in the intensity of the impressions and their persistence, the result would bear an analogy to the difference in effect between a single electric current and a number of currents from different points simultaneously poured into the subject to be charged. The physical character of processes of mind would be suggested, though not proved; still, when we know that there are a large number of "progressive" readers who not alone have their thinking done for them, but who flatter themselves that they are doing some thinking on their own account when they detect an implied analogy and mistake it for a proof, we can estimate the utility of suggestion in the hands of such a master of rhetoric as Mr. Spencer. It serves for argument.

For the present we shall content ourselves with pointing out that a feeling, say, is not the same reproduction in consciousness as the perception of a truth mediately or immediately, and with denying that a combination of feelings, sensations and perceptions responding to never so many impressions can be described as a multifold resultant of feelings, sensations, much less hardly attended-to impressions. We shall also notice a curious obliviousness, yet even this is apparently part of his method; that while pretending to rise from the hardly conscious action to be observed in the simpler forms of life to the highest gradations of the human mind he forgets that the attempt to show identity of nature and the terms employed in showing it demonstrate differences more than in degree, even if these were compatible with identity in his sense.[7]

We are not departing from our attitude of reserve in stating that no one really says physical and mental phenomena are identical. Mr. Spencer will go no farther than that they are subject to the same law of evolution, and that mental phenomena are expressible in terms of physical. But it is suggested all the time; for what else is the meaning of the attempt to account for the results in the case of mental phenomena on the theory of increased vibration in the molecules over the vibration of the molecules when the results are set down as physical? Sentience in the molecules we pass over, because it appears to be an explanatory consequence of the increased vibration; in other words, an hypothesis for debate where

[7] He assails philosophical language as well as the ordinary use of language when he finds a difficulty in words for his sleight-of-hand.

silence will not do. At the same time it is not altogether to be lost sight of, for it certainly is a confession of the weakness in the theory of matter and motion accounting for mind.

But we pause to ask the question, is there any one whose opinion is worth hearing who will say we can obtain the first genesis of mind from the laws of physical evolution? Both Huxley and Tyndall have very plainly declared that the mystery enveloping the dawn of feeling in the simplest organism is as profound as the genesis of a distinct sensation in the most developed. Now, Huxley says that the first dawn of feeling in the simplest organism is a gap that evolution has not bridged.

The difference in the mental processes of the two classes of organism must have struck this thinker as it seems to have struck Mr. Spencer himself, but the first has received it frankly. The mere instinct of self-preservation as directed to its prey in the case of the rudimentary organism must be something different, we think, from what has been observed perhaps in the lowest order of human experience. The movement of a low organism towards an object is something supremely different from the perception a savage has of the thunder which causes him to prostrate himself to the spirit whose voice he thinks is in the sound. It may be urged that what is in the mind of the savage is not a sense perception represented by an idea, but a complex of consciousness; that this complex consists of many elements, each one of which is significant of a phase of evolution in an order of its own and the whole the result of a history extending through innumerable reaches of time.

Such a rejoinder would be an evasion of the point. The point is the identity of mental processes; we can only see this by comparison. We think what is before the savage is the idea of a power above him. The constituents of the idea is not the question, while the thunder is but a bell calling him to worship, whether through fear or gratitude. Assuming that the idea of a superior power was generated through associations giving it the complex character of constituent elements, it may be doubted—Mr. Spencer himself would doubt—that it could be resolved in the mind into its components. The most he would admit of such an idea is that it could be verbally analyzed, but unless he can show that such a complex of associations, crystallized into one conception, can be attained by the very lowest form of life, it appears to us he breaks down. Remember, we must begin with the dawn of feeling, and unless in an organism in which feeling only has dawned there is to be found a complex of consciousness similar to what the lowest type of human life is shown to be possessed of, there can be no such identity of mind as that one must grow out of the other, evolve from the other, change

from the other by internal action. If there be such a thing as evolution in Mr. Spencer's sense, it can only be arrested by equilibration; but that is the middle stage between growth and dissolution, between integration and disintegration. At this stage by his own authority, and necessarily from the force of the words, the slightest motion from outside disturbs the balance and then dissolution begins. We wonder how low types of organism survived on this theory.

We express no opinions of our own, but we might suggest one or two points: If the law of mental and physical evolution be the same, we should know by this time how mind resulted from the antecedent action of physical laws; we should be able to climb the steps from the inorganic world to the vegetable order, from the vegetable life to the animal life which seems as volitionless as the very vegetable life, and we should finally have ascended from the barely conscious creature to the consciousness of man.[8] But this does not exhaust the list of scientific subjects which should be clear to us as household words; the puzzle of the most adventurous materialists—how a nerve stimulus is converted into a sensation—should be understood by us. Why should this conversion take place? and why the infinite succession of ideas so ordered, arranged, combined that express themselves in all the facts of human life from the intercourse of nations to the details of the humblest family? Why should these take their start from repetitions of such stimuli?[9] For instance, though it may be inexplicable in words—as Mr. Spencer and his school say it is—how motion is caused, we understand that bodies communicate motion to each other. We all understand that it is a force distinctly physical which produces the change of place; we have the power, the resistance and the resultant in exact figures at our hands, but from the nerve to the sensation is a mystery deeper than the grave. From the sense perception to the world of imagination we can step along a path opening new prospects to us, because we are in the same order of phenomena.

We are not undervaluing a single statement put forward by Mr. Spencer; we are confessing ourselves free from bias; but we require reasonable grounds for accepting views which are a little startling in themselves and their consequences. He objects to arguments from consequences as unscientific in the case of social, moral and political questions, and, as one might expect, he objects to arguments drawn from the apparent incompatibility of certain revealed doctrines with certain declarations said to be made by science. As to the validity of objections from religious sources we could

[8] We say "barely conscious" in the method of what Mr. Spencer calls "inverted anthropomorphism" to give some notion of an animal life so remote from our experiences of our own conscious life. [9] Start as distinguished from source.

quote himself as a witness; our statement seems hard to credit, but we trust before we conclude that the reader shall find some strange inconsistencies in this philosopher, and among them that religious belief has an authority.

There is a point, however, that does not seem to have been taken by any critic, or at least enforced. The great characteristic of the positive school, and particularly that branch of it known as the agnostic, is insistence on scientific methods. The theory must be verified. If there be a law governing a class of phenomena, it must be called in; no other authority has a title to be heard. If it be an hypothesis when it suits the purpose of the school, it must be regarded as a law. If it be a guess, though amongst themselves science men will rate it at its value, the moment literary men, science men who belong to the "churches," or men capable of estimating the authority of statements in relation to the reasons for accepting them attack it as a mere assumption or suggestion, then all the science men rally round the flag, the guess becomes an hypothesis on the point of verification, if not an established fact. They form a close corporation, these men of science!

But to our point. The doctrine of the correlation of forces is called a law. We ask when was it established, when did it appear that all forces were convertible? It may be that they are, but this has not yet been proved. Besides, we have always understood that a law should not be applied to an area of phenomena not necessary to it. Theories are not to be multiplied any more than unnecessary beings. Conservation by energy is not necessary to the mind or to mental phenomena. If there were no mind, the physical forces could work as they do throughout the inorganic order. As far as they are physical they could work in the organic world apart from mental processes. It is confessed no science man knows what mind is beyond the assumption that it is a function of the brain which the matter threaded with nerves could do physically very well without. If all physical forces must be convertible into other forces, but not into psychological activities, to sustain the doctrine of conservation of energy, there would seem on the scientific and mechanical side reason for holding that mind and matter are two totally distinct regions.[10]

There seems to be much solemn trifling in the opinions of Mr. Spencer, and it would strike one as somewhat strange he could exercise such an influence on contemporary thought. His reputation is due in part to learning and ability of no common order, to a

[10] Mr. Spencer's argument from "the odor of the insane" and the experience of the connection between mental and physical conditions is beside the matter in the text.

boldness that strikes one as the very effluence of genius, a style the quality of which baffles all description. Though indebted to every one of his predecessors in English philosophy, he has infused into the ideas taken from them that appearance of originality which proceeds from energy of diction. He is a wizard at his spells; his style controls the reader like an incantation. He may carry the latter to a Witch's Sabbath, he may transport him like Byron's Cain over the wrecks of pre-Adamite worlds to the endless magnitudes revolving in space, but the reader feels at home in the orgy, is confident on the wing of a potent spirit. Contrasting the labor with which he is dragged through the morasses of Dr. Bain, he revels in the desert speed of Spencer, "not torrents more rapid and more rash."

In common with the other Positivists he could claim a share in the *eclat* arising from the results of physical discovery which so distinguish the nineteenth century. The changed conditions of life could be pointed to as the vindication of a system which made the senses the test of truth. These, improved by instruments, were thought to unlock the secrets of nature. Well, they have increased the number of facts concerning the relations of certain phenomena, as Mr. Spencer himself would say, but did they shed a single ray on any problem that has vexed man from the moment the mystery of existence confronted him? To the solution of these problems Mr. Spencer has devoted himself; we shall ask himself what difficulty has he removed? what perplexity cleared up?

At an early period he published what has been described as a crude work full of youthful enthusiasm. This is his "Social Statics." Twelve years later, namely, in 1862, he gave the world "First Principles," thenceforth he became a power with the English-speaking world and the Continent of Europe. We have a prospectus of the work he proposed to himself in carrying out his classification of the sciences into a system of knowledge. Critics have pronounced the classification illusory; they have said it was appropriated without acknowledgment from Comte, that the best ideas were Comte's and that he himself had fallen into the faults he criticized in Comte. We think a scheme for the unification of knowledge reflects honor on both men; but we think, too, that the founders of the old universities of Europe, the schoolmen[11] and their patrons should be allowed credit for their comprehensive views coördinating and subordinating the sciences constituting the whole range of human knowledge; we think Aristotle should not be forgotten for his encyclopædic knowledge and his transcendent employment of it.

We hear of a reaction from Mr. Spencer's influence. We doubt

[11] This is Professor Huxley's opinion, too, as we shall show later on.

this, at least in any important sense. There is an interesting article in the June number of the *North American Review* which would seem one of the straws showing this direction of the wind,[12] were it not that the article in the place of honor, "Anticipations; an Experiment in Prophecy," discusses an aspect of the social problem under the dominion of ideas which look at human life with the calm cruelty of Nature in her work of selection.

But apart from the two articles referred to, it may be admitted that there is a disposition to limit the scope of Mr. Spencer's hypotheses. From the very nature of his speculations this was to be expected. Putting aside any question as to whether or how far he was indebted to Darwin, Mr. Spencer invited criticism by the plunge from biological evolution to cosmical. His application of principles has been disputed by his allies or disciples; we do not say that their objections were invariably fortunate, though no doubt some were so, as Mr. Huxley's statement that Mr. Spencer's conception of a perfect gradation from purely physical to conscious life does not help us in understanding the first genesis of mind from any law or all the laws of physical evolution. From the opposite camp Mr. Balfour's later work was pronounced an epoch-making one; but though it aroused great interest not only among the friends of a sound philosophy, but among those who thought as Mr. Spencer thought, the empire of the latter is not weakened.

We fear there is no sign of this. A denial of conclusions here and there he would sneer at as the carpings of "scholars' mates,"[13] or of "litterateurs,"[14] or the objections of "so-called scientists"[15] touching the fringes of profound questions. He is such an autocrat that, as we have already hinted, he will not allow the test of consequences in moral and social questions. It may be pointed out that his system derives moral and social phenomena alike from mechanical forces and thus subjects them to the test of verification. No, the soundness of his views must be judged *a priori*. The theory is to be judged by the consistency of the terms as though any good work of imagination would not fulfil this test.[16]

It has been very stupidly charged that the schoolmen tried to discover natural laws by the aid of the syllogism and without the aid of observation. Mr. Spencer, an empiricist of the most pronounced type, evolves from his inner consciousness social facts and the competitive value of institutions, but he will not permit an objector to appeal to that experience called history, to that which is to be found in the practical business of government or to that in the

[12] "Great Religions of the World." [13] So he described Lord Salisbury. [14] A North American Reviewer and Matthew Arnold. [15] Professor Tait. [16] It will be admitted that the consequences to which a theory leads are not [16] It will be admitted that the consequences to which a theory leads are not necessarily a test, but in moral and social questions consequences may be the best test.

knowledge of local administrators and clergymen. He has not been ridiculed for this as the schoolmen are for the use of the syllogism attributed to them. He finds a constant principle in society inherited from law-abiding human ancestors and, we judge, from pre-human ancestors whose sweet reasonableness enabled them to escape the red tooth and claw and be selected for the propagation of their virtues to mankind. He has the answer of evolution, namely, that all is moving to perfection for the despairing disciple who, seeing how pitiless Nature really is, judges she must go on pitilessly in the future as in the past. How is this? On man's little planet progress onward and upward, while out in the infinites—homogeneity, balance and dissolution proceeding concurrently, a struggle of competing universes forever, systems dying and renewing from end to end of space—or, on the other hand, a universal dissipation melting into aimless force while man's little planet floats like an ark triumphantly in the azure.

That such a nightmare under the guise of scientific conceptions should strangle those who like to be thought progressive people would not disturb us overmuch, but the mischief is becoming more deeply seated because going down to the lower strata of society. In the meeting places of Scientific or Revolutionary Socialism Mr. Spencer is the great figure. Marks and Engels interpret him; Mr. Robert Rives La Monte has his gospel in "Herbert Spencer's little book, 'The Study of Sociology.'" Whether he intended it or not, Mr. Spencer, by weaving together into one work of world-wide evolution religion, society and inorganic change, has captured the tremendous discontent which in Germany used to be the inheritance of the scholar, a discontent now going down to the worker without the scholar's unselfish ideals. This is a peculiarity of the German mind. The students who were afterwards to become professors dreamt dreams of personal, philosophical, political and social environments with which they were at war. Göethe's "Faust" is representative as well as ideal. Though no frenzy of political or social ideas burns in him, he is perplexed by deep problems from which he seeks escape in the Lethe of sensual passion. It is not difficult to guess the influence of wild aspirations, imbedded in the stream of German story, giving fire and energy to illusions. Faust is not only the embodiment of that craving for knowledge beyond the horizon of life which is a property of mankind when unsettled in belief, but he expresses the hatred of naked hands beating against the bars of power and the infinite hope of generous youth that it can accomplish all it aims at. These were the hidden sources of many of the currents in that great and seldom realized creation. But not the Germans only, but the French and the Italians have surrendered

to the sway of Mr. Spencer; these the most logical peoples of Europe have put him in the pantheon of high philosophy.

We think it is time, therefore, that his philosophy should be severely examined as the stronghold of the secular or anti-Christian spirit of our age. We say this, of course, in no hostility to science. He himself admits a *modus vivendi* as possible between what he calls these two great orders of human activity,[17] namely, religion and science. But in any case Mr. Spencer's philosophy can hardly be called the science of the relations between the subject and the object; yet this is what philosophy really is, as distinguished from the sciences of the subject and the sciences of the object. If he be criticized, science or philosophy is not therefore criticized. It occurs to us we have to some extent obtained from him admissions of failure in constructing a philosophy of the universe in which, by his system, both subject and object are intended to be united in their relations, that is, that his philosophy is no true philosophy.

Catholics, we apprehend, look at certain intellectual performances with the indifference with which they regard those religious or socio-religious aberrations which appear and disappear in the march of life. This mood will no longer answer. Men recognize the Church as the great power for order because she is the asserter of inviolable morality, and they like to know the secret of her influence in terms which may satisfy the exacting demands of the critical intellect. Our opponents have possession of the reading public. We are out in the cold. The Church is among our opponents, but she is not understood. They see that all Catholics are not ignorant and that some of the most educated are the staunchest believers. These very readers of the publications of science men have got rid of his Satanic majesty, so the activity of that potentate cannot account for intelligent Catholics being loyal ones. As long as it was believed by Protestants that the devil could promote morality as well as work miracles of mercy with infinite sweetness, sympathy and solicitude, there was no need to seek farther for Catholic good works. But Satan or any other infernal power is no longer in existence to be divided against himself. Science men have dismissed him from the stage; so the wonderful beauty and life of the Church must be otherwise explained, and they seek that explanation. Galileo's palatial prison is a fact, but intelligent Catholics love their Church. The Spanish Inquisition was a fact, but that Church abounds in inexhaustible treasures of charity and sacrifice for others. Looking at the matter in this way, decent outsiders might be con-

[17] We are reminded here of a blot in Mr. Balfour's practical conclusion in his "Defense of Philosophic Doubt." He feels the need both of religion and science. This is as bad as the temporary equality Spencer gives them; with the latter religion is deposed like Lepidus between Octavius and Antony.

ceived as big D-ing the Inquisition, Galileo, Bruno, bloody Mary as nuisances, or regarding them with the contempt with which Mr. Weller, we think, spoke of the lion, the unicorn and the arms of the crown as a collection of fabulous animals.

A good-humored indifference will no longer serve if Catholics are desirous of doing their duty, for there is a non-Christian generation rising. Mr. Gladdens' statistics[18] are encouraging, but outside the Church there is a deplorable tendency to rationalism with which the instinct of religion or, more accurately, the religious sentiment is struggling, but hopelessly struggling, when a cultivated Naturalism plays the apologist of interest and passion. To this we have in addition the dogmatic pretensions of pseudo-science, accepted as true science, scoffing at the claims of the Church to speak as the voice of God. It will be necessary to give some instances of the dogmatic intolerance on the part of representative scientific men—not mere amateurs or dabblers, for these, as one would expect, hardly if ever possess the modesty of knowledge[19] or of the consciousness of their limits—we mean representative men like Mr. Huxley and Mr. Clifford, of real power in the scientific world as dogmatically intolerant.

The Church has not made the attack on science, not in a single instance. We care not how this statement may be received, we stand over it; but men of science, notably in France during the eighteenth century, in Germany during the nineteenth century, went out of their way to attack the Church, the latter finally widening the line of battle to include all religion. England hardly counts, for her opposition was purely political, except during the brief rule of the revolutionary sects of all kinds that sprang from Puritanism. These Puritan infidels hated the Church with the honesty of an intense passion and a profound ignorance.

It is a little too much of *lupus in fabula* to talk of the despotism of the Church and thence by transition to speak of the opposition of religion to science, while "priestcraft," "clericalism," "tyranny over thought," "bigotry," "hostility to progress," "love of power" are among the amenities of science. We dismiss this point for the present and proceed with our advice that a war should be at once begun against false science. We say that the campaign should be opened by an analysis of Mr. Spencer's system of knowledge, and opened in this way. A man versed in the scholastic philosophy should lay hold of his psychology and whatever may be called his ethics.

---

[18] "Great Religions of the World." [19] The late Lord Rosse, if he may be called an amateur, was one of the most modest of men in estimate of his attainments. The present, a fellow-student of the writer, is totally devoid of conceit, though he knows more than many a professor.

This phrase "whatever may be called his ethics" means more than perhaps meets the ear. His ethics turns up in his social theories as his sociology confronts you in his ethics. The attempt is to make the problem of both the same; both are evolutionary. This must be admitted by Mr. Spencer himself. We are not offering an opinion of our own; if we were doing so it might be that his ethics and sociology are to be the new guide to conduct, the authority to replace morality and religion. In pursuance of the line of attack a specialist in biology who is at the same time well read in the history of institutions should contribute his help to this part of the work. In dealing with his views of social forms and the origin and nature of morals the various branches of anthropology should be brought into requisition. There are some excellent suggestions in Abbé Hogan's "Clerical Studies" which the reader can interpret for himself in a manner that will more clearly express our views than we have the power to convey them. The difference is only in the direct employment of the suggestions. The Abbé does not refer to Mr. Spencer—that would be no part of the office he undertook—and his apologetics is of the parry, ours is of the thrust.

It is obvious from what we have been saying about this part of the Synthetic Philosophy that an intimate acquaintance should be had with the policies that have appeared in action and those that have been formulated by theorists. Although we have no confidence in speculations proceeding from conceptions of the primitive man and his relation to surroundings, what has been said on the subject should be considered, if for no other reason, to take away an excuse for retorting that the critic was ignorant of a material part of the philosophical structure. If we dared to offer an opinion, Mr. Spencer and his school talk nonsense when they go back to a period antecedent to history to explain the origin of social institutions. History in our meaning includes every trace man has left of himself, though there is an insuperable difficulty in deciding as to the comparative antiquity of traces. A cranoge community in Ireland, a lake village in Switzerland, a cave dwelling in England or France might be contemporary with or subsequent to a politic empire totally effaced by a later one at the cradle of the race, a pastoral kingdom with all the highest elements of civilization blotted out by an invasion long anterior to Hellenic settlements. That this difficulty is on the surface ought to be clear from the speculations of Biblical critics respecting Canaanite progress and its effect upon the hordes that conquered the Canaanite, from the speculations surrounding the origin of Rome and the inferences drawn from words and religious ideas about the men who lived in Greece before the Greeks. But, though on the surface, the difficulty will not be seen

by an intellectual pride that makes a science man a god unto himself. He believes his imagination is a witness.

Assuming that Mr. Spencer and all evolutionists in the moral order back to Critias are right in saying man was at first a savage of a lower type than a Bosjesman or an Australian black fellow,[20] what can they know about him except by a comparison with the Australian black fellow or the Bosjesman? Yet they will not take the trouble to learn all that either of this type of savage tells them. If the assumption be sound, a comparison of savage tribes and peoples should be exhaustively made, no matter where they are to be found; whatever earlier writers said on the subject should be critically but dispassionately considered. Is this what is done? It is not. A preconceived theory is fortified by a few alleged facts from travelers who neither knew the dialects of the tribes they visited nor were capable of catching the meaning of their institutions and customs. This is not all; "facts" presented are arbitrarily selected. This is a grave allegation; we could prove it.

Our philosopher and the whole phenomenalist school go back to a time the evidence of which they only infer from evolution and report phenomena of life as though they were eye-witnesses. These gentlemen who take all their data from experience give us the conditions and circumstances of a period which only exists in their imagination. They appear to have come across a few hunters wandering over large regions for their livelihood, preserved to that moment by the selection of nature from her own forces, from strong brutes and from the hostility of savages hunting like themselves. How a few of these could have come together and have kept together we are told—we shall deal with this tale by and by—but we have them, nomads of the most simply animal type. We may concede, but without prejudice to our right to withdraw the concession, that they had some notion of government, some notion of authority and obedience, however rudimentary. Later on one or two animals are "domesticated"—the dog especially. They sleep amongst the branches of trees—their arboreal habits are clearly traceable in the hairs on the arms of their descendants in high places of Europe and America to-day—the dogs watching at the foot of the trees over the safety of their masters' families and the safety of the goats which accompany the migrations.[21] Next we have settlements; agriculture begins, the idea of property and the idea of religion emerge. We shall have to look at this account of the origin of society and

---

20 Critias tells us that at first man was without law or order (ἄτακτος), a mere brute (θεριώδες). He hits the blot on the theory of morals from society. Laws having arisen, evil actions which no longer could be done openly continued to be done in secret. We commend this to Mr. Spencer and Mr. Leslie Stephen.

21 The goat must have been "domesticated" at an early period for the nurture of the infants. The women at this stage were warriors and hunters, doubtless.

morals from another point of view, namely, when criticizing the evolution of man from the highest anthropoid or purely animal stage. But we repeat that the assumptions contained in the theoretical histories of primitive man should be severely examined. The bare hypothesis of a rise from the lowest condition of savage life may not appear to be of much consequence one way or the other. We now know that man is capable of guiding a great or high civilization, and we know that he has progressed from a savage condition in Europe to the semi-civilization of the middle ages, and has attained the place we find him in to-day. Do we know all this? Do we know all that is contained in these assumptions? There is first the rather important question whether man can emerge from a savage to a higher stage without contact from outside, whether from barbarism even to civilization without such contact; but besides these considerations, important in their implications though they are, we find involved in the evolutionary accounts of man and society a menace to religion and to the principle that man is endowed with conscience as a fundamental law of his nature. We shall attempt to show this when saying a few words about the nature of knowledge and the manner we acquire what Mr. Spencer described as, perhaps, the larger part of our knowledge.

The aim he had in view was to realize his conception of a universe of phenomena—his own term would be a universe of relations. We must translate into explicit terms his interpretation of its origin;[22] and our translation is that matter, in molecules lifeless, invisible and absolutely alike, existed until finally at the end of what must have been a space of duration in comparison with which vast cycles are nothing, motion as a sort of demiurge set the molecules in activity. Mr. Spencer denies, apparently with reluctance, the hypothesis of self-creation, but that does not free him from the burden of holding that matter exists from all eternity and existed in the same condition until change began. We have said, at what must have been the close of unbeginning cycles, motion comes in and sets things going. There is no time, but immeasurable, absolutely measureless reaches of duration before change began, because any point of time, however far back, is definite and finite. But when we go backward from that to the not beginning, there is no measurement possible. Some very interesting questions spring from this aspect of Mr. Spencer's theory. We regret we have no room for them in this paper, but one of such questions would be the possibility of thinking of such a period without a conscious intelligence existing through it. Mr. Spencer only

---

[22] It is absurd for Mr. Huxley to say Mr. Spencer kept aloof from a theory of the origin of this universe. He posits matter in First Principles and tries to refute the fact of creation out of nothing as an untenable hypothesis.

gets out of this by a sort of harlequinade into the trap door of his Absolute Reality.

We cannot be charged with unfairness in our translation, for we are keeping to his text, but putting it into intelligible language. We cannot too often insist that the units of matter must have been alike before the appearance of the demiurge. Where did he come from? We are not calling him motion now; we insist on calling him a spirit of intelligence and will. He must have been there before or have been created. By whom? The Absolute Reality is not even the shadow of a shade; at most he is the ghost of words phosphorescing unthinkable attributes like dead lights on a grave. Then by whom was the demiurge or sub-creator motion created? He was endowed with more than gnostic æons possessed of power; for if the units of matter were of one size, weight, solidity altogether one and the same, motion, by converting them into the infinite shapes of nature and infusing into so many of these shapes all that life expresses, was a spirit of no mean order. In this way we have read Mr. Spencer's account of the process which theists call creation.[23]

The "fulness as yet unrealized" spoken of in the foot-note is an implication contained in the prophetical hypothesis of perfection that all things were evolved for man. When *First Principles* tells us this, we are reminded of the excellent wit employed in laughing at the old Christian and the ancient Hebrew view of God's relation to His people. Every reader will remember that the handiest objection of Rationalistic friends to so many of the great truths of Revelation was that no one could conceive such a theory of relations as would make God a doting father and man the spoiled child of dotage. It was absurd to suppose such a Being as God would create the universe for man. The history in Genesis meant that and nothing else. The earth and sea and air and all they contain were made for him; the sun, moon and stars to minister to him. The Great Creator condescended to watch over him, to be interested in his moods, his changes from joy to grief, his affections, his passions, articulate or inarticulate, the wild waywardness of his impotent rage, the desolating path when his power was commensurate with his anger, condescended to rebuke and instruct him. All this we believe, but we ask is it more ridiculous to believe this than that all nature was evolved to provide an unassailable dwelling place for the Spencerian man?

[23] An American disciple of Mr. Spencer unconsciously confirms this interpretation. We are not sure, though, that by drawing out his master's principles from their folds he does not involve him in a *reductio ad absurdum*. He tells us "the inorganic" does not exist "save as a reminder of a fulness as yet unrealized." The fulness is to be realized by change, but change is the equivalent for organism and organism "only exists in the subject." This stilted blundering implies a truth—that with all his realism Spencer is a material idealist.

It is unnecessary to say there are omissions, and not accidental ones, from Mr. Spencer's data for his science of society and morals. He has set the example of experimenting in statistics. We venture to say, if sociology be a science, partial statistics are of very little value. For departmental government they are important, but sociology, if it be the science of society, must rise to the rank of a philosophy; in other words, a synthesis of all the studies that deal with man as a social animal. Truncated by its system as political economy had been when it aimed at so vast a conception, it went nearer to realizing it than its recent supplanter. If we were to say that the science of society is religion, we would be at once put down as a fool or knave.

But what is Mr. Spencer when he gives an elaborate list of subjects to be tabulated and gives no place to the present or past labors of the Church in the work of social amelioration? This is positive knowledge. Does Positivism mean there are no facts cognizable save those of experimental physics, the facts of animated nature, the statistics of labor, the statistics of prisons? We can well understand he was brought up with a prejudice against the Church. Suppose in maturer years his love of truth would not permit him to emancipate himself from such a prejudice as the opinion that from the Pontificate of Leo X. she has been the enemy of progress; he could have taken that period as a starting point and gone back century and century to the age of the Apostles.

With his rare power of dissection he could have separated the elements of social life, he could have gone to the hut of the serf, to the castle of the baron, to the provincial parliament, to the municipal corporation, to the palace of the King and the palace of the Bishop. He could have seen the life of the trade guilds; he could have learned the work done in the monastery. He could have observed how the guilds regulated every detail of industry, settled every dispute, and how commercial integrity was to the artisan a religion, as unselfishness and honor were to the knight. He could have learned that chastity became a realm of thought and life necessary as the atmosphere one breathed; so that it was fabled the wild and terrible things of the forest were tame and gentle in the maiden's presence.

He could have seen how in the midst of tumult and disorder art expressed itself as though all that was best and noblest in human nature found a voice. Great unselfishness went forth to the works of architecture, sculpture, painting in mediæval times. The mechanic cutting the stones for a cathedral, ay, or for a village church, worked for eternity. The same spirit animated the architect whose conception was to be the embodiment of an almost apocalyptic vision. We need go no farther. We need not say what he could

have beheld of laborious, sympathetic, patient life in monasteries. Hard study, endless copying, teaching were a part of silent unknown lives; so that he himself owes to the monks more than he does to the far-off brute ancestors he is forever bringing on the scene as the sources of intellect and virtue. He could mark the steps of progress of the whole social universe of those days, difficult, no doubt, at times, for violence and fraud ruled then as unconscionable contract rules now—slow and faltering steps, but onward steps, bringing to us here to-day that sense of honor, duty, courtesy, charity we boast of.

The fact seems to be that it was easier for him, as it is for all who think like him, to invent a system of morals and imagine a society than to accept social institutions which owe their solid and enduring qualities to Christian morals. We hear of the contrast furnished by the unloveliness of the lives of so many Christians as compared with the beauty of unbelievers' lives. We do not know; we suggest what Critias said about the evolution of morality. We, of course, recognize externally a difference between a gentleman in his laboratory or study and the toiler, in sordid surroundings, home from work that gives no promise of a gracious day, or the semi-detached of the industrious class, those creatures never sufficiently employed and who are drawn by temptations ever to a lower depth. Society is very hard on them, very hard on those gravitating to the criminal classes, and of course on the criminal classes themselves as the great danger. It might be worth considering whether society is not responsible, whether or not she has been the cruel stepmother compelling them to lie in ashes or eat the husks of swine. If religion can do anything for them, she ought to be permitted and not sneered at by Mr. Leslie Stephen; if the priest can do anything for them he should not be ostracized by Professor Clifford, treated as an enemy of the human race. Who are these? Who is Mr. Spencer that he should take it on himself to mould the lives of men as he has tried to set the universe in motion? They will not recognize virtue as a law to the individual, therefore they cannot recognize it as rising to a height of heroism under the fosterage of religion. Yet there are men outside the Church, outside any church, who are ready to acknowledge that Christianity has taken up the potentialities of such virtues as forbearance, chastity, honesty, truthfulness, charity and that which pagans called magnanimity and we the every-day virtue of forgiveness of injury, and nourished them into attributes which we may without exaggeration describe as above humanity. The acknowledgment of this would not do for the Naturalism of science; there was some generosity in the Naturalism of literature, but the man of experiments has the soul of a charlatan; he cannot give credit to a

rival. We should like to know how the contrast between the lives of certain unbelievers and so many who profess to be Christians can prove the theory of evolution, unless it be assumed that descent from brute ancestry is a higher guarantee for virtue than the conviction that the soul came from the hands of God.

That there is much to regret in the lives of Christians is true, but take Christians and unbelievers of the same social rank and let us then make comparison. For that matter, there is a depth of sin and sorrow over human life which must move the reflecting mind more profoundly than any feeling besides. The ambition of the statesman, the soldier's love of glory, the poet's passion for fame are all great incitements to exertion, but there is nothing in them that sinks to the inner recesses of the heart; they are a sort of nervous vanity satisfied by effort. But to him who feels for the care and misery around us, who knows that this is but a small part of the blight lying over the range of man's existence now, and that the same experience marked his path through all the ages since first his disobedient will disturbed the universal harmony, there are but two gates out, despair or belief that the evil is but a temporary one. Man brought the evil on himself is so logical a view that it puzzles one to understand how it is not received as readily as any of their hypotheses by men of science. Aristotle was wise enough to see that, positing a universe, men judged badly in thinking that what struck them as evil in their own poor little experience would not be found good in relation to the entire order of things. Mr. Spencer's era of perfection to which this little planet is moving is not as satisfactory a theory as that a continued consciousness when the lamp of life shall have gone out will receive compensation for pain of mind and sickness of the heart endured in patience here. Any other alternative would be a thought more terrible than the oppression that makes the wise man mad.

We come to the evolution of man. We ask for a little information. Critias was thoroughgoing and precise. Man was a brute until laws made him a hypocrite. This was the differentiation which he seems to have transmitted to his descendants under the name of diplomacy. But Mr. Spencer gives us the hazy hero who left a rudely cut stone axe-head in a cave. We suppose his father was a beast hardly distinguishable from himself in mind and body. This must have been so. From the protoplasm upwards the differentiations were minute. All forms of rudimentary life must have been entered and gone through; in the higher stages parallel developments began to take place perhaps. Nature favored a particular family of anthropoids; this family went on improving by gradual stages, or deteriorating into more graceful but less useful physical

qualities. Why did the arms shorten? This did not improve the climbing powers, the catching powers, the powers of strangulation. What necessity was there for standing or walking erect? The infant does not begin that way; it does not seem natural. What advantage were the looking-upward eyes which made the Greeks call man ανθρωπος? Use-inheritance is Mr. Spencer's chief agent in evolution, but this factor would stand in the way of every step of what we mistake for progress. A differentiation survives if it be useful to the animal; but what of one that is not only useless, but an embarrassment?

We cannot get man on along that line; we must try another.

If the anthropoid father were separated from the human son by a mental line so fine, he should be moved by passions, cares, sorrows, hopes with a keenness hardly less than his son's. He should have his traditions about the intermediate stages through which the family had passed to their rise in life; and these would be verified by seeing in the woods so many specimens in whom the tendency towards human differentiation had been arrested. The "links" would have then existed; unfortunately they have disappeared since. He would have done some little carving on fish bones or rocks, and so preserved their counterfeit presentments. All the more developed animals have the rudiments of the vocal organs; this last anthropoid at the door of humanity would have them only a shade less than perfect, his less human ancestor only a degree inferior to his own, and so on. So we could have evidence from tradition and art of the days when the more remote ancestors swung from branches by their tails, flung themselves from heights, hardly touching projections, and landed safely hundreds of feet below. The race was clearly degenerating. Those remote ancestors would be made gods. Perhaps the totems of primitive creeds and of modern savages are survivals of such traditions, but distorted or confused in their physiology by the disintegrating action of time or through the vanity of professional historians or the fatal influence of priestcraft. On the other hand, if the race were degenerating, and here we mean in relation to the energies directed to self-preservation, why should it have survived tailless, talking, standing erect, walking on hind legs, sitting down in the most uncomfortable manner and undertaking a system of synthetic philosophy?

It must be borne in mind that in the evolution of the higher species from less useful types there must have been spent a vast period of time. Artificial selection is no criterion at all; in the first place, it is only employed on varieties; in the second, every precaution is taken against misses and indiscriminate pairing. Mr. Spencer was so sensible of this that he adopted Lamark's theory of use-inherit-

ance, not merely to hasten the physiological side of the process, but to account for the steps of mental and ethical evolution. That theory is his sheet-anchor. Well, Weisman may be trusted to deal with that factor. But even allowing use-inheritance, the time of development must have been immense, for that agent would not have the same control of the process, nor could it act as intelligently as a cattle breeder or pigeon fancier. The gradation slight from the lower to the higher—we are not dealing with pigeons or cattle; we are starting from monkeys and coming up to men—if at all conceivable, should have taken a long time. We ask why are there no traces of the steps? The gradation of intelligence would be imperceptible; there should be traces wherever paleontology finds fossils of extinct animals; above all, wherever traces of man are found. We cannot admit that there was a bridgeless chasm between the first man and his brute father. There would be no appreciable difference in their habits or affections; the ties uniting them would be the same as those between the son and his own family. Whatever constituted the difference between the man and the brute, it was not the intervention of society, for if the man were capable of forming social relations, his father was capable.

Mr. Spencer denies reason as a differentiating principle. The differentiating fact is the size and substance of the brain. The reasoning faculty is only a developed memory aided by imagination. The process we call reasoning is nothing more than the grasping of associations recalled by present sense-perceptions or by an act of memory purely volitional. Then there could have been no recognizable difference between the anthropoid father and the human son. Why call him a brute rather than his son? Critias was consistent.

But suppose the brain became large and more fitted for higher processes—Mr. Spencer does not allow thought, though he is forever using the word unthinkable when displeased with an opinion—a curious consequence might follow. Is it not the fact that as the faculty we call reason becomes more highly developed it does so at the expense of the more purely animal qualities? Or, to put it another way, the development of mind is at the expense of body. That is, that as mind develops the expending physical qualities of strength, activity, hardiness and endurance, and the recuperating ones of sleep, digestion, and so on, suffer, if not deterioration, a transformation less adapted to survival in the conditions which must have existed in that most distant time in which man must be placed according to the hypothesis.

The answer, doubtless, would be that his superior mind enabled him to cope with the difficulties, and that this more than compen-

sated for his increased sensitiveness to the conditions of environment. Now, this we deny. His larger brain would make him more helpless in his infancy; he would require a longer period of care. His brute brothers would have all the physical advantages. Remember, differentiation does not manifest itself in all the offspring; and if they allowed him to reach the adult age at all, he would reach it broken in spirit, owing to his finer nerves, the weakling of the family and soon to be a victim of the red tooth and claw. There are other points which might be urged in this connection, but we cannot unfold them in our space.

It is difficult to regard with seriousness a philosophy which denies that law and religion are fundamental conceptions. The authority of both is an intuitional principle, and though everything is derived from sense by Mr. Spencer, he does not deny that this authority is one of those persistent phenomena of human nature which rest on some ultimate truth or necessity. Now, if religion have an authority and law an authority of this kind, the concepts of both must be capable of mental embodiment and must, of course, be fundamental. An animal origin for all mental processes leads him to deny that we can have such concepts, or, for that matter, anything like ideas of a general or abstract nature, though he correctly says that such ideas —general and abstract—form the large part of the subject matter on which mental processes are employed. We say "correctly" because general ideas are necessarily the subject matter of every step in reasoning, and certain abstract ones may be the "forms" of sense perceptions. But we think that his term "symbolic conceptions" for ideas of both kinds—general and abstract—is a totally inadequate manner of describing their character. Not only that, but knowledge would be impossible if we could only have symbols instead of ideas. It is easy enough to see how his confusion of mind arises—it may not be quite so easy to set him right—but he will not allow the faculty of intellect, he will only acknowledge an idea that can be painted in the imagination; but a general idea, or an abstract idea as distinguished from a general idea, he will not allow because we have no picture of it in the mind; we have nothing but some vague presentation linked to the word. That there is a plausibility about his report of what takes place in the mind respecting the employment of such ideas and of the chief characteristic of them we admit. Unless the report possessed such an appearance of resemblance to what our own experience records he would not be listened to; but we say plainly the general idea of "triangle" is not a symbolic conception, nor is the abstract idea of "time." A symbolic conception, if it means anything at all, means a more or less arbitrary sign selected by the mind to mark something, but having no essential re-

lation to that something—just as it is selected to denote an unknown quantity.

Now, the word time is so essentially associated with the succession of events that even if we have no definite relation of time-places at the moment, an indefinite succession is fancied. The same may be said with regard to the abstract idea of motion, some indefinite association, a body changing place, the same with regard to the general idea of a triangle, an indefinite picture, though possibly the figure may be outlined like a particular triangle. In all these there is nothing symbolical; each has a relation to a reality from which it cannot be separated. The symbol *X*, though susceptible of being employed to represent an unknown value, might as easily change places with *A* and become the known quantity symbol.

It was only incidentally we referred to his view of reasoning and his view of general ideas. We suggest, however, that an examination of his theories should be instituted by a competent man, who shall dissect them bit by bit. What remains for us to say must be rather general than would be such an examination. We are simply asking from Mr. Spencer his proofs of certain media used by him to establish the five issues standing at the beginning of this article as the crystallized sense of his philosophy. We have not laid much stress on the changing employment of terms, though that inconsistency with which he is charged might be shown to be greater if we did so. Though denying reason, he insists upon it as the only test of truth; but we are ready to admit that the process which he makes to stand for the reasoning process is the standard to which he intends that his truth should conform. Still we cannot quite allow him to escape on our admission; for there is something so like a policy in the employment of terms and in the denial of distinction between mental processes that it would not be altogether safe to overlook his use of terms.

Broadly, then, whatever cannot be judged by reason is nonexistent, that is to say, whatever has not taken hold of the mind through a succession of impressions of such intensity as to be recorded in consciousness does not exist. All we know of existence is relation; of truth all we know is the relation of relations. A judgment which is a deduction of reason[24] expresses the experience that two ideas are related, because we have invariably found them in association. It might be objected that this was not merely confounding inference with immediate knowledge, but it was making inference a merely complex idea, and the mind a storehouse of ideas differing in complexity instead of a power or a union of powers of

[24] It is nothing of the kind; it is the immediate knowledge of a property common to the two terms that express it.

reshaping, transforming, uniting ideas; so as to make them give pictures like the *Prometheus Desmotes* or the *Divine Comedy*, or draw conclusions in mathematics, or make predictions in celestial physics, or frame hypotheses to be verified in chemistry. This objection, startling as it is when offered to a view from such a man as Mr. Spencer, is really well taken. If these Titans of science walk about with their heads in the clouds, we are not responsible. A cast-iron view of nature leads to their absurdities. If it were not necessary to evolve everything through physical laws, it would not be necessary to make the most fundamental intuitions and the most complicated chains of reasoning nothing more than a brute's more developed memory.

As we have shown, the greater number of our ideas are such as do not admit of association in Mr. Spencer's sense. Either the universal is made by abstraction, as we may be allowed to say it is, or it it merely a symbolic conception, that is, a symbol like *X* or *Y*, that is to say, no conception at all. There has been a good deal of fencing as to whether the word "adequate" might not be used as an epithet qualifying Mr. Spencer's statement that we can have no conception of God because we can have no conception of His attributes. A finite intelligence cannot grasp them. Any such qualification is not necessary, or rather it would concede his thesis at least impliedly. It is rather better to ascertain whether his psychology starts from sound principles than to answer objectionable positions by restrictions like the word "adequate." His utter misrepresentation of reason and the reasoning faculty affords ground for doubting his genesis and nature of ideas, not merely abstract or general, but ideas for which a singular name stands. In point of fact, admitting that we cannot have an "adequate" conception of "infinity," "eternity," "omnipotence," and so on, it appears to us the acceptance of Locke's theory of their formation is improved by Mr. Spencer into a denial of their existence. They are "unthinkable," and therefore they do not exist.

We must return to the brutes. They have "emotions;" but they have memory and imagination. Mr. Spencer gives them conceptions, at least rudimentary, of space, time, motion, and necessarily must give them the primordial concept, resistance.[25] Mr. Sutherland, who must be taken as an interpreter of the master, speaks of the "sympathy" of brutes as the basis of altruism, and Mr. Spencer attributes all moral and social feelings to experiences inherited from brute ancestors through the human ones. There is one very strange conclusion—it may be called irrelevant and even frivolous—that granting the brute's equipment as just described, he need not trouble himself about a future state. As a matter of fact he does not; this

[25] So Mr. Spencer calls it.

of course will be at once admitted, for whatever question there may be as to his having ideas of class,[26] there is none concerning his opinions on the immortality of the soul. But, then, man has no evidence that his soul will outlive the body, or that, which is a correlative of the proposition, there is a future state. We must take things calmly.

It is very true Mr. Spencer places all such knowledge as we possess in experiences derived from sense. Clearly the brute could not from this source obtain the idea of a future state, and he has no other avenue; he is in the same condition as man as to knowledge of it. But is the condition of both the same? The brute has no idea of it at all; we are inclined to think he has no idea beyond the present moment. Without looking at brutes, as in Descartes' sense, automata—though mistaken as that philosopher was in his estimate of experience, he has been too severely criticized by comparing his animals to animated chairs and tables—we submit that even those acts which appear as proceeding from foresight in the lower animals are present impulses, like the succession of steps to secure their prey. Mankind has a dread of or belief in a future state, that is, much more than the idea of it. Mr. Huxley's test is an unfortunate one; if he could not recall from the other world or arrest on his way to it the friend he valued by however great an effort of his will, he could not make the soul survive by as great an effort when the time of separation came. There is no connection between the two efforts of will; they are directed to different objects, over one of which he might have a compelling influence conceivably, over the other of which he could not conceivably have a compelling influence.[27] So despite Mr. Huxley, we insist that mankind has a persistent conviction that something in him survives the body. Our science men recognize it in their primitive man. All their theories of the origin of religion assume it. Whether he learns it from dreams revealing himself to himself at a distance from where his body lies in sleep, or revealing to him the apparitions of the dead who visit him in his dreams, the idea and the conviction are there. They persist in all the religions; they are said to be the underlying substance of all of them, however various in doctrine, ceremonial and influence. But a persistence in belief of this kind is, according to Mr. Spencer, proof of an ultimate fact; so we have here, according to his principles, something that not merely distinguishes man from the brutes, something not referrible to sense perceptions, but we have the most plausible of all the reasons, given since modern science made materialism the fashionable hypothesis, for the conclusion that

[26] The instinct or sense of kind is not the same. [27] This queer statement shatters the theory of will being merely the balance of attraction.

the doctrine of the immortality of the soul does not contain as a necessary implication the immortality of all other living things.

As we cannot get all our convictions from animal sources, it is possible that the processes of human reasoning are not obtained from animal processes. If the syllogism be the form to which all sound reasoning must submit, all deliverances of reason must be expressible by it. Mr. Spencer says that it "fails utterly" to express any of them; this opinion is too important to be passed over, but our space gives us no choice. The policy of his philosophy depends upon it; but what is more to the purpose—his own trustworthiness is weighed and found wanting by it. We charge him with resolving processes of inference into successions of concepts. It might be sufficient to say that we "derive"[28] certain ideas from observing such successions, but we could not draw the inference led up to by the word "therefore." However, among the deliverances of reason which the syllogism cannot express he includes such intuitions as the axioms of Euclid. This is more than amazing. The notion he intends to convey by this pronouncement is that relations seen by the intellect are associations derived from sense experience. As usual, the prehuman ancestor's experiences account for these intuitions as they do for the rules of morality. One is in a labyrinth, from which it is easy enough to break forth if common sense (not the metaphysical, but plain common sense) presided. But we might be compared to a bull in a china shop if we got out by treating the involutions as imaginary boundaries; we have, therefore, to keep the paths. Things which are equal to the same are equal to one another, set down as an inference by Mr. Spencer, is one of those axioms which children find in the front page of their Euclids, and which are similar to those contained in the old Logical tracts as the conditions precedent to the elementary study of the science.

It is a misrepresentation of a very remarkable kind. The axioms were supposed to be recognized by the learner as fundamental principles of knowledge before he entered on the subject. They were never referred to afterwards. The lengthened and elaborate rules for the various figures of the syllogism supposed them part of the learner's mental furniture. He compared Lord Salisbury for criticizing some of the pretensions of the sensional school to the savage who makes a deity in order to chastise him—what he meant was that Lord Salisbury invented opinions for the school and then proceeded to refute them. Well, we charge himself with the method of attack attributed to Lord Salisbury. Either Mr. Spencer does not know what a syllogism is, either he thinks intuitions are inferences—in

[28] Elicit would be the more correct word because, say, time is not derived from succession, but elicited by the perception of it.

other words, that intuitions are not intuitions—or else by an appearance of acuteness and a parade of considerable knowledge of mental science he has tried to throw dust in the eyes of his readers. He makes the ordinary proposition, which logicians call a judgment, a deliverance of reason that cannot be put into the form of a syllogism. We are not going to waste time over this fetish of the angry philosopher; no one but himself has ever pretended that that which is but a step in an argument is the whole argument. The judgment may have been the conclusion of a previous syllogism, but when it becomes a premiss it holds the authority of an intuition; it is no longer inferential knowledge; it belongs to the higher form of truth, immediate knowledge. And here we may throw out a notion for what it is worth: does Mr. Spencer suppose that mediate knowledge is of a higher kind, carries a greater certainty than immediate?

In *First Principles*, in order to prepare the way for proving the theistic conception of God unthinkable, Mr. Spencer begins to say how we have, or think we have, an idea of the earth, or of all organic beings. What conception do we form of the earth? he asks; and he admits that the name calls up "some state of consciousness." "We have learnt by indirect methods that the earth is a sphere; we have formed models proximately representing its shape and the distribution of its parts. . . . Such perception as our eyes give us of the earth's surface we couple with the conception of a sphere. And thus we form of the earth not a conception properly so called, but a symbolic conception."

We deny very distinctly that his own account of the acquisition of the idea of the earth makes the conception symbolic. We can, he admits, obtain a true conception of the globe before us; that is the model, with its distribution of land and water. The reason we cannot grasp the conception of the earth is its vastness. Now he himself seems to set the limit to our conception of God at the inability to pass the finite. The greatness of the attributes of God, if finite, would be conceivable or thinkable, as Mr. Spencer would say in the scientific jargon which imposes like the sonorous platitudes of Carlyle. If the idea be unthinkable because God's attributes are unlimited, the idea of God would be thinkable if the attributes, however much they surpassed those we associate with humanity, were finite. We insist that by his own tests we can form as definite an idea of the earth as of the terrestrial globe over whose continents and oceans we pass our hands. The gradual mode of acquisition, we submit, has nothing to do with the greater or less definiteness of the concept, though of course the gradual mode of acquisition has everything to do with its greater or less completeness as a subject of attributes.

The confusion arises from his denial of the intellectual faculty.

His measure of "a conception properly so called" is the power of the imagination to picture it; we ask first what constitutes the difference in conceivability between the artificial globe and the earth? He replies the immensity of the one. Second, we ask in what way is a universal idea "not actually conceived?" Everything man thinks about has to do in some degree with such ideas; and whenever he lifts himself from the narrow considerations of particulars he has to do with such ideas. They must be "actually conceived to enable him to do this—actually conceived as in some degree corresponding to the realities they stand for.[29] These ideas are clear in the intellect as the products of it, though incapable of imaginative representation; they are conformable to the realities they stand for to the extent of the mind's knowledge of these realities; nor is there a school of mental philosophy which has ever questioned the belief in such conformity.

We have most inadequately dealt with this dream of a dream; we mean the philosophy of Mr. Spencer. We have no knowledge, we have no God, no conscience, but we are promised an era of human perfection. The imagination of a period ere change began, that is the period of "the being" before the "becoming" disturbed the motionless silence of eternity, is more fantastic than any stuff that dreams are made of, more airy than gossamer, less substantial than threads of moonlight woven for Titania. For this reflection of a mirage we are asked to throw away everything that makes life valuable, the authority of conscience over the powers of the intellect and heart. We are no longer to live in the light of loyal performance of duty—because it is duty, not merely because it has relation to others, but because it is duty, always duty, to be thought of as such at every moment of our lives, in the privacy of the secret chamber as well as in the market-place, and alike in the desert or the city. We are to surrender to the social body the keeping of conscience, because conscience is its child, its emanation, effluence. Then shall dawn the happy world when professors shall rule in the high departments of State, inferior schoolmasters in the lower ones, when favorite pupils shall be the police, when in theory property shall be in common, in practice the possession of the few. But after a few years of it men of science with a vestige of humanity will call for the dissolution of a universe accursed, and plain men, outraged in their affections by learned licentiousness, will look around them for the banished God to bring back the old order of belief, fidelity, purity, justice.

GEORGE MCDERMOT, C. S. P.

New York, N. Y.

[29] Concept and idea are not happy words to express what is in the mind when the object there is expressed by a universal.

HARNACK AND HIS CRITICS ON THE "DE ALEATORIBUS."

WITH the sole exception of the higher criticism of the Scriptures, there is probably no branch of ecclesiastical learning on which more labor has been spent during the last fifty years than the study of the documents of the primitive Church. We know so little of the growth and development of the Christian communities in the earliest times, of their internal government, of the relation of their members to the external world, that any additional evidence which we can obtain is of no small value. Moreover, the twilight of the first two centuries is at the present time the chosen ground for controversy. Every line, every expression of the writers of that period is eagerly scanned by rationalist, Protestant, and Catholic scholars, in the hope of finding some fresh support for their respective doctrines. Hence the publication by Professor Harnack in 1888 of his commentary on the "De Aleatoribus"—a small treatise preserved among the works of S. Cyprian, but which has long been known not to have come from his pen—aroused the very greatest interest among all students of Church history. In this commentary the learned professor undertook to show that the work in question was the oldest ecclesiastical document in the Latin language, for it was nothing less than a homiletic treatise addressed to the bishops and the faithful by Pope Victor I. (192-202); in short, that we possess in it a Papal encyclical of the second century.

Till the publication of Harnack's comment the "de Aleatoribus" had rested in comparative obscurity. Bellarmine, in his "De Script. Eccles." (1612), notices that the author was evidently not S. Cyprian, but a Pope. It seems, however, that it is to Nicholas Faber (ob. 1612) that we must allow the credit of having been the first to detect the indication of a Papal origin; for Rigaltius, who included in his edition of S. Cyprian (Paris, 1648) some annotations of Faber's, gives the following note to chapter vii.; "Nic: Faber notat hunc tractatum non esse Cypriani: nam ex hoc loco apparere alicujus Pontificis Romani scriptum esse?" But save for a few scattered notices, the work had shared the fate of the other pseudo-Cyprianic writings and had been neglected by the commentators.

It is needless to say that so important a discovery gave rise to a controversy among continental scholars which may almost claim to form a small literature of its own. At first the conclusions advanced in the commentary were received with no little favor, and several eminent Catholic scholars—among others Fr. Grisar, S. J., and

Professor Le Jay—held that the case was proved. But before long the arguments on which the theory was based were submitted to a rigorous criticism by Professor Funk, of Tübingen; and from that time the majority of those who had a right to be heard pronounced themselves unfavorably to Harnack's view. It must, however, be owned that when it came to giving a definite answer to the questions as to authorship and date, the opinions of Professor Harnack's critics were widely divergent.[1] The discussion was for the most part carried on in reviews and periodicals. Separate editions of the "de Aleatoribus" were, however, published by Hilgenfeld, Miodonski and the members of the Louvain ecclesiastical history society.[2] Of these Hilgenfeld regards it as unquestionable that the expressions of the author imply a claim to be Pope, but holds that the rigorist doctrine contained in the work makes it no less certain that the writer was not the true occupant of the chair of Peter, but a Novatian anti-pope. Hence he assigns it confidently to that Novatian Bishop Acesius who was present at the Council of Nicaea. Our readers may possibly recall the story of how he was asked by the Emperor Constantine to explain the difference between his tenets and the doctrines of the Church; and how, when the Emperor had heard his exposition of the stern views of the rigorists, he replied: "Get your ladder, Acesius, and climb up to heaven by yourself." This theory of Professor Hilgenfeld lessens the value of his work; for Acesius is not mentioned by Socrates as anti-pope, but as one of the Novatian bishops of Constantinople. We know nothing of any Novatian anti-popes besides the founder of the schism himself. Miodonski's edition, as was to be expected from that learned classical scholar, aims at restoring as far as possible the corrupt text of the work to its original form. To do this was a task requiring very special qualifications, as the treatise is written in late colloquial Latin. He holds that the author must have been one of the Popes between 250 A. D. and 350 A. D. The writers in the Louvain edition incline on the whole to adopt the same view.

Notwithstanding the wide divergence of opinion which exists among authorities, it seems to the present writer that a careful consideration of the facts and arguments adduced may enable us to arrive at certain definite conclusions about the work. It would be beyond the scope of this paper to touch on all the questions, some of them of great interest, which have afforded material for investiga-

[1] A full bibliography of the subject may be found in Ehrhard's "Altchristliche Literatur und ihre Erforschung von 1894-1900." Ehrhard gives it as his opinion that the controversy cannot yet be regarded as finally settled. [2] Hilgenfeld: "Libellus de Aleatoribus" (Freiburg, 1889); Miodonski: "Anonymous adversus Aleatores" (Erlangen, 1889); "Etude critique sur l'opuscule 'de Aleatoribus,'" par les membres du séminaire d'histoire ecclésiastique établi à l'université de Louvain (Louvain, 1891).

tion. Hence after some account of the work itself and of the sources from which our knowledge of it is derived, we shall simply deal with (1) its nature and purpose, (2) the question of its Papal origin and (3) its date.

The treatise is not found in the old MSS. of Cyprian's writings which we possess, nor in the ancient catalogue of his works dating from 359 A. D. discovered by Mommsen. There are, however, four MSS. of importance in which it has a place. Of these, one, the Munich manuscript (M) dates from the ninth century, the Troyes MS. (Q) is of the eighth or the ninth century, while those preserved at Ratisbon (T) and Paris (D) are assigned to the tenth and ninth centuries respectively. These all belong to what has been termed by Hartel the second family of Cyprianic MSS. Besides these four there are a certain number of manuscripts of later date; but they do not differ in any important particulars from the earlier authorities, and are manifestly derived from the same source. The *editio princeps* of the "de Aleatoribus" is the edition of S. Cyprian's works published by Morel at Paris in 1564; we have no record of the authority which he followed. A careful comparison reveals the fact that the four MSS. are all derived from a common archetype. This we may assume to have been extant in the eighth century;[3] hence this common archetype is the sole source from which the work has come down to us.

Our four authorities differ to some extent among themselves. M, Q, and T, are somewhat closely related; but the Paris manuscript diverges from them in many places. Hartel in his edition of S. Cyprian has preferred to follow the Paris MS., and Harnack decides even more definitely for its readings. Miodonski is, however, no less unhesitating in his preference for the group M, Q, T, and as it seems to us, on good grounds. He shows that these three manuscripts in many places have preserved forms which, though at first sight may appear mere blunders, are really characteristic of the Latin in which the work was written, viz., the vulgar Latin of daily life. The Paris manuscript, on the other hand, again and again replaces these forms by their classical equivalents.[4] Harnack, it must be confessed, has declared himself ("Texte und Untersuch," 1900, pp.

[3] Such is the conclusion of Hartel in his edition of S. Cyprian, Vol. III., p. xxxiv. Exstitit igitur saeculo octavo codex litteris uncialibus scriptura continua exaratus. [4] One case in which the group M, Q, T has preserved for us what is evidently the right reading is sufficiently interesting to merit separate mention. At the beginning of chapter viii. D reads, "scientes quoniam furor iste maleficus et venenarius est, sed iterum in die judicii igne rotante torquebitur." M, Q, T read, "scientes quoniam foris maleficus et venenarius et iterum in die judicii igne rotante torqueri," a reading which appears hopeless till it is observed that it contains two quotations from the Apocalypse, and should be translated, "Knowing that 'without are criminals and prisoners' (Apoc. xxii., 15): and moreover that 'on the day of judgment they will be tormented on the wheel of fire.'" (Apoc. xiv., 10).

112 and seqq) still unconvinced on the question of the respective value of our authorities; but he does not bring forward any argument to meet the reasoning of his opponent.

The point is of some interest even to those who are not specially concerned with questions of philology. For this small tract, which only extends to some 250 lines of printed matter and would scarcely occupy more than six pages of this review, is one of the few documents we possess composed in the form of Latin used when that tongue was first employed as the ecclesiastical language. The Latin of the "de Aleatoribus" would surprise those who have never made acquaintance with other than classical models. It is, as we have said, the dialect of the common populace, and it brings home to us somewhat forcibly that the laws of Latin syntax were not scrupulously observed in ordinary life. We find such forms as "parentorum" for "parentum," "tuemur" used as a passive verb, "perdet" as a present tense, "a Dei servos," "ab illos mores" for "a Dei servis," "ab illis moribus" and the like. In addition to this there are a few forms used which are recognized as characteristic of the Latin employed in the province of Africa. It is not quite the only document in this *lingua rustica* that we possess. Preserved among the letters of S. Cyprian are five letters which are now known to have been originally composed in the same dialect. And it is important to observe that one of them is a formal missive from the Roman to the Carthaginian clergy, showing us that it was so completely the ordinary language of the Roman Christians of that date —250 A. D.—that the clergy did not scruple to use it in an official document.

But if the language is somewhat uncouth, the sequence of thought which connects the eleven chapters into which the work is divided is perfectly clear and logical. The author says what he wishes to say with uncompromising directness. This will appear plainly from the following brief analysis:

Chapters 1 to 4 form an exordium in which the writer dwells on the grave responsibility imposed on him as a Bishop, since if he neglect to correct the faults of his flock he will most assuredly be himself punished by Christ (cc. 1-4). From this consideration he passes in the next five chapters to the actual sin with which he desires to deal. Gambling is one of the ways in which the devil catches those who have escaped from his snares (c. 5). The gaming table is the natural home of a whole catalogue of sins; it leads men to perjury, hatred, the scattering of ancestral wealth, and further even to dissolute living; for the gambling hell is only too often a brothel also (c. 6). The main indictment is then preferred—that gambling is inseparably connected with idolatry. This is proved

by an account of the invention of the practice. A man of great attainments in learning invented the dicing-board by the direct inspiration of the devil; to the images of this wicked man the gamblers pay divine honor (c. 7). A Christian who gambles has ceased to be a Christian, and has become a pagan; for even if he does not formally sacrifice, he is a partaker in the sin (c. 8). The ninth chapter sums up the last three in a piece of passionate invective. The tenth is of peculiar importance. In it we are assured that the Scriptures warn us that while for some sins there is forgiveness there is none for offenses against God. The work then concludes with a peroration (c. 11), in which Christians guilty of this sin are exhorted to put their riches to a better use; instead of scattering them at the gaming table to lay them in the presence of Christ, the angels and the martyrs on the table of the Lord, and by distributing them to the poor to lay up a treasure in heaven.

It will, perhaps, be well to quote *in extenso* the two passages in the tract which have given rise to most discussion—the opening sentences in which the author speaks of the eminence of his own position and the chapter in which he tells us that for sins against God there is no forgiveness. Father Ryder, of the Oratory, indeed gives it as his opinion that had it not been for these two passages we should not have waited so long for commentaries on the "de Aleatoribus;" but that while Protestants were deterred by the testimony to Papal claims, Catholics were no less daunted by the difficulty of explaining rigorist doctrine in the mouth of a Pope.[5] The first chapter runs as follows: "A heavy charge is laid upon us, fellow-Christians, the care of the whole brotherhood. It is made yet heavier through the reckless wickedness of abandoned men who are drawing others into crime and involving themselves in the snares of death.[6] It is gamblers to whom I refer. The fatherly goodness of God has bestowed on us the authority of the Apostolate; of His heavenly mercy He has ordained that we should occupy the chair by which we represent the Lord; through our predecessor we have as ours that source of the true apostolate on which Christ founded His Church, and have received authority to bind and loose, and with due regard to reason to forgive sins. And on these very grounds we are warned by the doctrine of salvation to take heed, lest if we constantly overlook the faults of sinners we suffer with them a like penalty."

The following is the passage (c. 10) which is said to contain a rigorist doctrine: "The Lord says in the Gospel that for a sin

[5] *Dublin Review*, 1889, July and October, p. 84. [6] We here adopt Miodonski's emendation "ex saevâ perditorum hominum audaciâ, id est aleatorum, qui alios ad nequitiam se in laqueum mortis demergunt." The reading of the MSS. "et rea perditorum omnium audacia id est aleatorum animos ad nequitiam se in latu mortis emergunt" is hopelessly corrupt.

against God there is no excuse nor forgiveness, and that none receives pardon. 'If any one,' says He, 'shall speak blasphemy against the Son of Man it shall be forgiven him; but to him who shall have sinned against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven neither here nor in the world to come' (Matt. xii., 32; Mark iii., 28); and again the prophet says: 'If by trespass one man sinneth against another prayer shall be made for him to God; but if a man shall sin against the Lord, who shall pray for him?' (I. K. ii., 25). And the blessed Apostle Paul, the Steward and Vicar of Christ, in the exercise of his care over the Church says: 'Ye are the temple of God, and Christ dwelleth in you; if any man violate the temple of God, him shall God destroy' (I. Cor. iii., 16). And again, the Lord in His Gospel denies sinners and reproaches them, saying: 'Depart from me all who work iniquity; I never knew you' (Matt. vii., 23). And the Apostle John says: 'Every one that sinneth is not of God, but of the devil; and ye know that the Son of God shall come to destroy the sons of the devil' (I. John iii., 8)."

A feature of the work which plays a considerable part in the controversy concerning it is the large number of citations from Scripture. Harnack reckons thirty-one of these. But if we add those which escaped his notice and count as separate references words which the author has taken from more than one chapter of the Bible, and united to form one quotation, the number is somewhat greater. Thus in the margin of the Louvain edition we count no less than thirty-nine references. These quotations are not from the Vulgate, but from the Itala, and are practically identical with the form in which the same verses appear in S. Cyprian's writings. This alone would show that the work could not date later than the fourth century; and when the treatise first engaged Professor Harnack's attention he did not venture to determine its date more closely than this. In his edition of the Shepherd of Hermas (1877) he tells us that it seems to have been written not long after the time of Cyprian —at latest perhaps in the fourth century.[7] It is not the canonical books only of which the author avails himself. He quotes from Hermas and from the Didache. In chapter 2 he cites Herm. Tim. ix., 31, 5, introducing the passage with the words "the Divine Scriptures say *(dicit scriptura divina)*;" and again in chapter 4, after quoting St. Paul's words, I. Cor. v., 11, he says: "And in another place [it is written]: 'If any brother lives after the manner of the Gentiles and is guilty of deeds like unto theirs, cease to be of his company. And unless thou do this thou shalt be a partaker in his works.' "—Herm. Mand. iv., 1, 9.[8] This quotation is immediately

[7] Op. cit., p. 21. [8] These words, "Quicunque frater more alienigarum vivit," etc., are referred by Harnack to this passage of Hermas. There are, however, certain differences between them. Hilgenfeld denied their identity, and P. Minasi went

followed by one from the Didache: "If any brother sins in the Church and does not obey the law, let him not be reckoned amongst you till he do penance, and let him not be received into fellowship lest your prayer be defiled and hindered" (Didache xiv., 2; xv., 3). When we remember that both the author of the Muratorian fragment and Tertullian (de Pud., c. 10) deny to the Shepherd a place in the canon, and that the Didache certainly never held so high a place in the estimation of the Western Church as did the writings of Hermas, we must own that there are good primâ facie grounds for thinking that we have to deal with a very early document. As we have seen, the "de Aleatoribus" calls the Shepherd "scriptura divina," and quotes it and the Didache in juxtaposition to the words of S. Paul.

Nor have we yet exhausted the problems which arise from our author's citations. In chapter ii. he quotes some words which have not hitherto been traced to any book, canonical or otherwise.[9] And yet another issue is raised by the words in chapter iii., "The Lord warns us and says, 'Grieve not the Holy Spirit who is in you,' and 'Quench not the light which has shined in you.'" Professor Harnack believes that we have here two apocryphal sayings of our Lord. We are ourselves inclined to think that this is an error, and that there can be no doubt that the author is simply quoting with some freedom Ephes. iv., 30: "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God," and I. Thess. v., 19, "Quench not the Spirit;" but to this point we shall return later. Here then we may leave our description of the "de Aleatoribus;" our readers will probably be satisfied that brief though it be, it offers for solution not a few questions of more than ordinary interest.

NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE WORK.

With regard to this the first of the three points which we proposed to discuss we cannot but think that the most natural conclusion to arrive at is that it is a homily, and that we possess it in the precise form in which it was originally delivered. The style of the work would appear to indicate this—the vigorous invective of certain passages (cc. vi. and ix.), and the formal peroration at the end. Moreover, the author twice addresses his audience as "fideles"—in chapter i., which opens with the words: "Magna nobis ob universam fraternitatem cura est, fideles," and in chapter v., where we find the words: "Quid illud est, quaeso vos, fideles;" while after having de-

so far as to endeavor to show that they are a quotation from a lost letter of S. Paul to the Corinthians (*Civilta Cattolica*, 1892, 409-489). He is refuted by M. Callewaert in "Une lettre perdue de St. Paul et le 'de Aleatoribus.'" Louvain, 1893. [9] This quotation runs as follows: "Existimate sacerdotem esse cultorem, et omnes esse apud eum [delicias], granaria plena, de quo quidquid desideraverit populus meus saturetur."

clared in chapter v. that the gaming table *(aleae tabula)* is "one of the devil's plagues and an incurable wound of sin," he opens chapter vi. with the words: "Aleae tabula dico, ubi diabulus præst," a rhetorical repetition which scarcely appears possible except in a speech intended to be actually delivered.

This, however, is not Professor Harnack's view. As we have said, he holds the work to be a homiletic treatise addressed to the Bishops and faithful. He bases this opinion on the fact that in the first four chapters the duty of Bishops to exercise their disciplinary authority is developed with much care. The obligations of the episcopate are, he tells us, urged with far too much earnestness for us to suppose that this part of the work was merely intended to justify the severity with which the writer was about to speak. Besides, although after these chapters the author throughout uses the singular number, yet in this introductory passage he employs the plural, dwelling not on his own responsibilities alone, but speaking as it were in the name of the collective episcopate. The only legitimate conclusion from the passage is that the author knew that his audience comprised both Bishops and faithful, and that he desired alike to rouse a lax episcopate to the fulfilment of their duties and to move the consciences of the faithful at large in order that they might not be recalcitrant under a discipline more severe than that to which they had grown accustomed.

This argument does not appear to us in any way convincing. What could be more natural than that a Bishop who intended to rebuke a serious fault in his flock with great severity should devote a considerable part of his sermon to reminding his listeners of the solemn obligations which the episcopal office carries with it? Without such a justification it might well happen that his words would be taken amiss as imperious and unwarranted by the very men whose hearts he desired to move. More especially might he think it well thus to preface his reprimand if the delinquents were to be found, as was probably the case here, among the wealthiest members of his flock, and perhaps were for that very reason the less amenable to control. Nor can the fact that in these chapters he speaks in the plural number be urged as an argument against this view; the employment of the plural of dignity in such a passage is only what was to be expected.

It is, however, the treatment of the question of gambling that most clearly shows us that the work, whether a homily or not, was at least addressed to a local church, and was no encyclical directed to the faithful at large. The severity of its tone astonishes us. A gambler is no longer a Christian but a pagan, he is an idolater, he has committed a sin against God, for which there is no forgiveness.

Harnack assumes that these denunciations are directed against all gambling of whatever kind. Such a supposition involves us in insuperable difficulties. For though the practice is condemned by certain writers in the early Church, they never speak of it in terms such as these. Clement of Alexandria (Paed. iii., 11, 75; P. G. viii., 651) severely reprehends those who spend their time in taverns, idling, dicing and insulting the passers-by. S. Ambrose describes the gambling hell in a passage of singular vehemence (de Tobia xi., 38); but neither of these fathers accuses the gambler of a relapse into paganism. The same is to be said of the decrees of Councils. The earliest official condemnation of the practice which we possess is contained in the acts of the Council of Elvira (canon 79), about A. D. 300. But in this, although the guilty person is excommunicated, he is to be readmitted to communion after he has shown his repentance by abstaining from the practice for a year.[10] No severe disciplinary penance is imposed on him. The measures prescribed in the apostolic canons are equally mild. The 42d and 43d canons deal with gambling and prescribe that Bishops, priests and deacons, if they do not desist from the practice, are to be deposed; the inferior clergy and laity are to desist or to suffer excommunication. How are we to explain this manifest difference? The author of the "de Aleatoribus" brands gambling as an act of apostasy; all other authorities treat it as a mere offense against Christian morals. The explanation offered us by Professor Harnack is that the author belonged to the party who favored a more rigid ecclesiastical discipline, and further that it is evident that he must have written before St. Cornelius (251 A. D.) definitely decided that there were no sins which the Church could not forgive. Such an explanation is wholly inadequate. No party, however averse it may have been to exclude the penitent from pardon, ever took a tolerant view of idolatry or could have inflicted lenient penances on a practice which involved the burning of incense to a pagan deity. Had the customs described in the "de Aleatoribus" been universally prevalent, the decree of Elvira and the expressions of Clement and Ambrose would have been impossible. The only satisfactory explanation appears to be that suggested by M. Callewaert, viz., that by a custom peculiar to the city where the sermon was delivered, images of the patron of dicing were erected in the public gambling rooms, so that those who frequented them became by an almost necessary consequence guilty of the sin of idolatry.[11]

[10] The decree runs, "Si quis fidelis aleam id est tabulam luscrit nummis, plamit eum abstineri: et si emendatus cessaverit post annum poterit communion, reconciliari."

[11] This appears to be the solitary reference in the whole of Latin literature to the practice of offering sacrifice before casting the dice. Who was this inventor of dicing to whose statues worship was paid? Probably the Egyptian god Thoth whom Cicero (de deorum nat., III., 22-55) identifies with the last of the five

It is important in this connection to observe that the author's strictures are almost certainly not directed against games of chance played merely for purposes of recreation, but against that social ulcer, the gambling hell, and against certain specific acts of idolatry which took place there. All the evidence we possess goes to show that games of dice were played by the primitive Christians. The mere habit of playing apart from gambling may have been regarded as unbecoming in a cleric, but could scarcely have been looked on as a sin. Dice are not infrequently seen carved on the tombs of Christians in the Catacombs, and in some cases dice-boards have been found placed by the bodies. Lynesius (ep. 105, P. G. 66, 1484) when pleading to be excused from the responsibilities of the Bishopric of Ptolemais, mentions among the reasons which render him unfit his inveterate habit of playing dice. It is clear that he is not speaking of a sin, but simply of a habit indicative at the worst of some trivial idleness. Was the view correct which holds that the idolatry described in the "de Aleatoribus" was practised whenever and wherever dice were thrown we should have to attribute to the Christians of the first age of the Church a laxity totally inconsistent with the testimony of history. It is, however, far more consonant with probability that the reverence paid to the image of the inventor of dicing was restricted to the public gaming tables. Indeed, unless it be admitted that this was the case, and that further even as regards the public tables the custom was local and not general, the diversity between our author and other early Christian writers is totally inexplicable.

THE QUESTION OF PAPAL ORIGIN.

We may now turn to the question of the Papal origin of the tract. Even though it be not an encyclical, yet if it could be shown that we possess in it a homily addressed by one of the early Popes to the Church of Rome it cannot fail to be of great interest. The argument rests wholly on the passage from chapter 1 translated above. There are three expressions in this passage capable of being interpreted so as to indicate a Papal authorship. In the first the author tells us that God has bestowed on him the authority of the apostolate *(apostolatûs ducatum);* in the second he claims to occupy the chair by which he represents the Lord (Vicariam Domini Sedem); in the third he uses the words "through our predecessor we have as ours

divinities bearing the name of Mercury, whom he distinguishes; this Mercury is known in the Greek mythology as the slayer of Argus. Thoth is said to have taught the Egyptians laws and letters as well as the art of dicing (Plato Phaedrus, 274, C.), so that the description of him as a man of great attainments in learning (studio litterarum bene eruditus) is justified. Some difficulties which seemed to be involved in this explanation of the passage are answered in the Louvain edition, pp. 39-41.

that source of the true apostolate on which Christ founded His Church"[12] *(originem authentici apostolatûs super quem Christus fundavit ecclesiam in superiore nostro portamus)*. In weighing the value of these expressions we must remember that while doctrine remains unchanged the precise signification of some term may become more definitely fixed, so that whereas it was once employed in a looser and more general sense, it gradually is appropriated exclusively to a particular application. It is hardly necessary to refer to the term Homoiousion as example of this, which at first, susceptible of a perfectly orthodox interpretation, was eventually used only to signify a definitely heretical doctrine on the personality of our Lord. For this reason we cannot say with any certainty that either *apostolatûs ducatus* or *vicaria Domini sedes* denote a Papal origin. Although we could not use them at the present day of any but the Holy See, yet examples may be found in early Christian writings of similar terms applied to other Bishops besides those of Rome. Thus Faustus of Regii writes to the Bishop of Ruricius[13] (ep. xi., P. L. 58, 862): "Domino beatissimo . . . atque *apostolica sede* dignissimo;" the author of the life of S. Basil attributed to S. Amphilochius says of S. Gregory Nazianzen (P. L. 73, 295): "*Throni apostolici* gubernacula moderatus est," while Sidonius Apollinaris says of S. Lupus of Troyes that he spent forty-five years "*in apostolicâ sede*" (P. L. 58, 551). These expressions are sufficiently similar to *apostolatûs ducatus* to make it impossible to build any argument on it. And the words *vicaria Domini sedes* find their equivalent in the following citations: John of Avranches in his de Officiis Eccl. (P. L. 147, 33) tells us that the *Pax Domini* said by the Bishop in the Mass "ostendit eum esse *vicarium Christi;*" and the monk Abbon on behalf of the Bishops of Paris and of Poictiers uses the words "unde fratres, nos episcopi *sumus vicarii Domini nostri Jesu Christi*" (P. L. 132, 766). If, then, any proof of Papal authorship is to be found, it must be looked for—as Harnack admits—in the words "*originem authentici apostolatûs super quem Christus fundavit ecclesiam in superiore nostro portamus.*" This "source of the true apostolate on which Christ founded His Church" can, says Harnack, have no other possible reference than to the *Cathedra Petri.* The words themselves contain a quotation from our Lord's promise to S. Peter in Matt. xvi. We may add yet another reason for feeling confident that the professor's interpretation is correct. The homily, as we shall shortly show, contains not a few echoes from the works of S. Cyprian. The author was evidently thoroughly familiar with his writings. Now

[12] On the sense here given to the words "portare" and "in" vide Harnack "d Aleat," pp. 99, 101, 134. [13] I am indebted for these and the following quotations to an article by P. Lenain in the *Revue d'histoire* and *de litt: religieuses,*" Nov., 1900.

no one can read this expression without being reminded of the well-known term which S. Cyprian several times employs of the Petrine prerogative, *origo unitatis.* When we consider the remarkable character of the phrase *origo authentici apostolatûs,* and also the evident familiarity of our author with Cyprian's works, it does not seem too much to conclude that the one expression is derived from the other. Now was it possible for the Bishop of any other see but that of Rome to make this claim? There is no doubt that it was not infrequent for other Bishops to style themselves successors of Peter. Peter of Blois (ep. 113, P. L. 207, 341) says to Geoffrey, Archbishop of York: "Quia igitur estis *successor et vicarius Petri.*" S. Hilary also apostrophizes the Bishops thus: "O dignos *successores* Petri and Pauli" (fragm. ii., 78, P. L. 10, 645), and S. Gaudentius (serm. 16. P. L. 20, 958) tells his hearers that S. Ambrose will address them "tanquam *Petri apostoli successor.*" But after all, though these expressions would not now be used, yet to claim to be the vicar and successor of S. Peter (which each Bishop in his own diocese in some respect really is) is very different from claiming to possess through inheritance from Peter the source of the apostolate. That the words *superior noster* refer to the apostle himself is not, we think, really open to question.

Funk urges that but little weight is laid on *originem* in the sentence; that the really emphatic words are *authentici apostolatûs,* and that it is on the apostolate, not on its source, that our Lord is described as having founded His Church. He maintains that the passage should be understood simply as a claim to possess that share in the apostolate which was the common inheritance of the Bishops. To this it may be replied that in this case *originem* would have been omitted, and that its employment by S. Cyprian is quite sufficient to show that it is not a word of little moment.

It may be noted that Harnack himself has put a weapon into the hands of those who deny the Papal authorship of the tract of which they have not failed to avail themselves. We have seen that he holds that in the first four chapters the author employed the plural because he was speaking in the name of the collective episcopate. Consistently with this view he maintains that throughout the whole passage the author associates the other Bishops with himself, and makes no claim in which he is not speaking for them as much as for himself. According to this view, the chair of Peter is the prerogative not of the speaker alone, but of all Bishops equally; the Pope sets up no special claim to be regarded as his successor.[14]

[14] To avoid the difficulty to this interpretation occasioned by the words "in superiore nostro," Harnack proposed to translate them as though they were in the plural, "each through his predecessor." Recently he has declared for the reading of D "in superiore nostra," which he translates "in our ancient Church"—*i. e.*, the ancient Church of Rome (Texte und Unters, 1900, p. 112.)

Though he adopts this view he holds fast to the Papal authorship of the work; he urges that such language would be natural in the mouth of none but a Pope, since the employment of the promise of our Lord to S. Peter in Matt. xvi. and of the commission given to the apostle in John xxi. (which is quoted in chapter ii.) are characteristic of the Roman Church. We do not doubt that the literary instinct of the professor, which led him to feel that the language employed was distinctively Papal, is correct. But it is, of course, patent that if his analysis is accurate, and this claim was made on behalf of all the Bishops, any one of them might have urged it in the same terms and have quoted the same texts. No convincing argument can in this case be brought to prove that a Pope was the author. We have, however, shown that there are no reasons to suppose that the writer was speaking in the name of the collective episcopate, and that the plural number which he employs may well be simply the *pluralis dignitatis*. Hence it is quite unnecessary to assume that he is claiming the possession of the *origo authentici apostolatûs* for any others than himself, and we venture to disbelieve that any instance will be discovered in which such an expression as "to possess through S. Peter the source of the apostolate" is applied to any other than the Pope.

DATE OF THE WORK.

The question of the date to which the work should be assigned may be considered the most important of all, since if we attribute to it a second century origin it must be held to be the oldest ecclesiastical document in the Latin language which we possess. Professor Harnack in assigning it to this period relied on three lines of argument, (1) the relation of the work to the canon of Scripture, (2) the peculiar character of the Latin in which it is composed, (3) the rigorist nature of the ecclesiastical discipline set forth in it. That his reasoning was not devoid of force may be gathered from the favor it met with from men whose competence to form a judgment is undoubted. But a formidable difficulty was almost immediately urged against attributing an early date to the work, in face of which we doubt if any arguments such as those adduced can stand. The objection in question was that to which we have already referred—the connection between the work and the writings of S. Cyprian. The most striking instance of the acquaintance of our author with the writings of the great Bishop of Carthage is found in the tenth chapter, the passage on the irremissibility of the sin of idolatry of which we have given a translation above. It will be remembered that the passage runs as follows: "For the Lord says in the Gospel that for a sin against God there is no excuse nor forgiveness and

that none receives pardon," and these words are followed by five proof texts, viz.: Matt. xii., 32; I. Kings ii., 25; I. Cor. iii., 16; Matt. vii., 23; I. John iii., 8. It is hard to believe that it is a mere coincidence that in S. Cyprian's Testimonia III. (a book of proof texts for the use of preachers) the 28th chapter runs thus: "That there is no remission in the Church for him who has sinned against God;" and then follow two out of the five texts quoted, Matt. xii., 32, I. Kings ii., 25. But what is more remarkable is this: the two texts which follow next in the "de Aleatoribus" are found in the two immediately preceding chapters of the Testimonia. It certainly seems to suggest to us that the preacher consulted his Testimonia for proof texts, that his eye caught the texts in the previous chapters and that he applied them to his purpose, though as a matter of fact they do not prove the point which he desires to establish. The threat against those who violate the temple of God (I. Cor. iii., 16) and our Lord's words: "Depart from me all ye who work iniquity" contain no proof that there is no forgiveness for sins against God. It may be observed that this remarkable parallelism had not escaped Harnack's notice, but he was of opinion that the difficulty was not of much weight because the authenticity of the third book of the Testimonia was not above suspicion. The genuineness of the work has, however, since then been vindicated by Dombart.[15]

This parallelism, striking as it is, is far from being the only one. A tabulated scheme of sixteen other passages in the "de Aleatoribus," with corresponding extracts from S. Cyprian, is given by Miodonski, and this list is greatly amplified by M. Callewaert in the Louvain edition. At first sight it might appear that we are endeavoring here to prove too much. It may be asked whether it is probable that a chance sermon would contain such a number of echoes from S. Cyprian's works. We reply that it is far from unlikely when we consider the great authority possessed by S. Cyprian before his fame was eclipsed by the greater name of Augustine. S. Lucifer uses no authorities but Holy Scripture and the works of Cyprian. S. Jerome (ep. 107, 12) to the advice to be constant in the reading of Scripture adds the words, "Cypriani opuscula semper in manu teneat," and Prudentius (Hymn 13, Passio Cypriani l., 8) says: "Te leget omnis amans Christum, tua, Cypriane, discib." In a paper like the present it is, of course, impossible to reproduce the researches of the two authors we have mentioned. We can only refer the reader to their works. We may, however, be permitted to quote two of the cases in point so as to afford some indication of the character of the more striking of the resemblances found. In "de

[15] Hilgenfeld's "Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie," xxii., 385. Vide Harnack "de Aleat.," p. 2.

Aleat.," c. 3, we find "episcopo negligente et nulla de scripturis sanctis documenta promente." S. Cyprian *ad Dem.* 3 has these words: "Nobis tacentibus et nulla de scripturis sanctis praedicationibusque divinis documenta promentibus." In "de Aleat.," c. v., we have: "Quam magna et larga pietas Domini fidelium quod in futurum praescius nobis consulat ne quis frater incautus denus laqueis diaboli capiatur." In Cyprian de Mortalitate 19 we meet with: "Quod Dominus praescius futurorum suis consulat," and in de Unitate 2, "ne denus incauti in mortis laqueum revolvamur."

If it, then, be really the case that our author is under considerable obligations to S. Cyprian we cannot assign an earlier date to the work than 250 A. D. Let us, however, consider the arguments brought forward on the other side by Professor Harnack; for, as we have already said, he pleaded his case so well as to convince not a few that we really possessed an original treatise of S. Victor.

We will notice first the argument from the language employed; for after what we have already said, this may be dealt with very briefly. It is urged that we possess some of the writings both of S Cornelius (251 A. D.) and of Novatian, the antipope who opposed him; that both of these wrote in the Latin of the cultivated classes, and that it is highly improbable that after their day a Pope would be elected who wrote in the dialect of the common people. We may admit this—though the force of such reasoning is always somewhat uncertain—and yet say that an argument which would be good when applied to the case of a formal treatise has no weight in regard to a sermon. Even if a Pope could write in good Latin, it by no means follows that he would not preach in the language of his auditors. There is no indication that this sermon was ever what we may term revised for publication; it was very probably delivered exactly as it stands at present.

The argument to which the professor himself attached most weight was, however, that drawn from the position adopted by the author towards the canon of Holy Scripture. He points out to us that in the work we have no less than twenty-seven texts introduced with various formulas of quotation, yet that in all these there is no indication that the author recognized the division of the sacred books into the Old and New Testaments. In place of this division we can detect by the aid of the formulas mentioned a tripartite classification. Citations from the Gospel are introduced with the words "*Dominus dicit in evangelis;*" the second formula is "*dicit scriptura divina*" or "*dicit scriptura*" or "*dicit Dominus,*" and these words preface the quotations from the Old Testament, the Apocalypse, the Shepherd of Hermas and the Didache; while the quotations from the epistles of S. Paul and S. John are cited with the words "*dicit apostolus.*" He

further notes that while the quotations from the Gospels and the Old Testament are accurate, those from the epistles are given with utmost freedom, and from this, when taken in connection with the fact that they form a distinct class, he draws the conclusion that at the early date at which the author wrote the epistles had not yet come to be regarded as of equal authority with the remainder of the canon.

It need not be pointed out how momentous such a discovery would be in regard to the history of the canon, even if we prescind from the theory about the position which Harnack supposes S. Paul's epistles to have held. It will probably strike every one that the author's greater accuracy in quoting the Gospels is easily explained if, as is far from unlikely, he was more familiar with them than with the epistles. Yet if it be true that previous to the separation of the canon into the Old and New Testaments the early Church possessed a tripartite division such as that indicated by the professor, to have detected this will have been indeed an epoch-making discovery. The value of the professor's conclusion can only be estimated by a somewhat close scrutiny of the evidence.

Now with regard in the first place to the quotations from the Gospels, there are but four of them in all, and of these four one (c. 2) lacks the required formula and is simply introduced with the words "*cum dicat.*" Though one exception may seem a trifle, yet when the whole induction is based on four instances it is not devoid of importance.

There are eight quotations from the epistles, and here again we are confronted by an awkward exception. This exception is contained in the words we have cited above: "The Lord warns us and says, 'Grieve not the Holy Spirit who is in you,' and 'Quench not the light which has shined in you.'" In view of the admitted freedom with which our author quotes the epistles we do not doubt that these words are simply Eph. iv., 20 and I. Thess. v., 19 freely cited; and this seems to be the opinion of all the commentators except Harnack. He regards them as two apocryphal Logia, which the author is attributing to our Lord. We own that we are tempted to think that he would not have been so unwilling to trace their origin to S. Paul had it not been for the fact that to assign such an authorship to them would have been destructive of his theory. There would then have been a quotation from the epistles introduced not with the formula "*apostolus dicit*" to indicate that it could only claim the inferior authority of apostolic origin, but with the words "*monet Dominus et dicit,*" which clearly denote that to the speaker it possessed the full character of the inspired Word of God.

But it is the third class which presents the greatest difficulties to the theory. It contains fifteen quotations, but of these six are of no

value to the professor, for they merely follow other quotations and are introduced with "*et iterum*" or "*et alio loco.*" The nine which remain are divided among no less than five different formulas. We have "*dicit Dominus*" four times, "*dicit Scriptura*" twice and "*propheta dicit,*" "*dicit Scriptura divina*" and "*in doctrinis apostolorum*" once each. Surely there is but little ground here for saying that the formulas employed are sufficient evidence to prove the existence of a special division of the canon. Nor indeed can it be said that the quotations from the Old Testament are uniformly more accurate than those from S. Paul. Some of them are correctly cited, others not so, while two which are apparently drawn from the Old Testament defy all attempts at identification.

Is it not far more natural to suppose that the author quoted without any special desire to indicate the part of Scripture he was using, and that though he usually cited the words of the four Gospels with the formula "dicit Dominus in evangelio," and those of the apostles with "dicit apostolus," yet he was not greatly concerned to hold fast to this manner of speaking, and did in fact sometimes deviate from it? If this be admitted, and it seems a reasonable explanation, we have not a shred of evidence for the alleged tripartite classification. Moreover, if further proof be required that Harnack was too hasty in drawing his conclusions, it may be found in the fact that the formulas in question are precisely those usually employed by S. Cyprian in quoting from Scripture. There is no doubt that he at least was cognizant of the division of the canon into the Old and New Testaments, for Tertullian habitually uses it; yet he scarcely ever thus distinguishes the sacred books. Our author's mode of quoting does in fact but provide us with a new proof that Cyprian was the master whom he followed.

The employment of passages from Hermas and from the Didache among the Scriptural quotations need not afford us much difficulty, though Harnack attributes considerable importance to it. Here, again, even if we concede that texts from these works might not have been employed in a formal homiletic treatise at so late a date as that to which we assign the work, there is nothing to surprise us in their occurrence in a sermon. It is true that Tertullian speaks scornfully of Hermas in the *de Pudicitia*, but it must be remembered that this was written after his lapse into Montanism; previous to his fall he had used it as a work which, if not canonical, was possessed of high authority. These books were part of the recognized religious literature of the period, and nothing could be more natural than that a preacher who recalled a text from them suitable to the purpose in hand should employ it without hesitation.

It only remains for us to answer the argument derived from the

alleged rigorist teaching of chapter x. It is, we are told, quite impossible that any Pope living after S. Cyprian could have taught publicly that there were sins for which there is no forgiveness. It was the Pope who in the question of the *lapsi* had taken the lead in insisting on the great truth that the Church has power to grant absolution for the most heinous crimes. It was due to the defense of this doctrine by the Pope that the Church of Rome was torn by the Novatian schism; nor had any voice spoken more clearly in their support than that of S. Cyprian himself. Who, then, can imagine that after this a Pope would teach the exact contrary, and, further, would assert that gambling—a much less grave sin than that of the *lapsi*—was one of the sins for which there is no remission? We reply that in the first place we have shown that the crime denounced by our author was not mere gambling, but the idolatry which he regarded as necessarily connected with gambling, and therefore the most grievous of all sins; and secondly that the words in question are susceptible of a perfectly orthodox interpretation, namely, that after wilful and persistent apostasy to obtain the grace of a true repentance is so difficult as to be morally almost impossible. That he does not teach that any single lapse into idolatry is a sin for which there is no forgiveness is evident from his exhortation to the gamblers in the following chapter to repent. He bids them in lieu of staking their money at the gambling table place it on the table of the Lord; which they could not have done were they to remain till death cut them off from the Church's communion. Such, too, and no other must have been the sense in which S. Cyprian desired Testimonia iii., 28, to be understood, unless we believe that in that passage he contradicted all his other utterances on the subject. It is only in virtue of a misunderstanding that our author can be credited with inculcating a rigorist doctrine, and that on this ground a very early date can be postulated for the work.

We may therefore safely conclude that we must not date the homily earlier than 250 A. D. It may have been composed by any of the Popes between that date and the middle of the next century. It seems impossible to arrive at a more precise result than this; for though certain peculiarities distinctive of the Latin of North Africa led Professor Landay to suggest that the author was S. Melchiades (311-314), who was "natione Afer," the use of these forms may well be due to the influence exerted on the author by his master Cyprian.

It is doubtless to be regretted that the results of our inquiry are to some extent negative, and that we must leave the name of the Pope who wrote the work an open question. Yet the study of the "de Aleatoribus" may be of value in more than one way. It is hard to read Professor Harnack's comment, enriched as it is with the wealth

of learning which he is able to bring to bear on the subject, without being at least for the moment persuaded that he is right. As we have seen, many Catholic scholars accepted his results as assured, and rejoiced over the discovery of so early an encyclical. It required the patient investigation of scholars specially qualified for the work to estimate the true value of his conclusions; but when that investigation had taken place the results so eagerly accepted proved to be as unsubstantial as the baseless fabric of a dream. Has not this its application with regard to much of that higher criticism of the Scriptures which is in vogue at the present day? Theories of the construction and the date of the sacred books are put forward by men possessed of great erudition and gifted with all the endowments requisite to state their case with lucidity and power. It is no wonder that their arguments seem to the reader overwhelming. Still it is well to learn from the history of this discussion that a really brilliant piece of reasoning based on internal evidence may, when weighed in the balances, be found wanting. We shall do well not to accept such theories too readily, but wait in patience till they have been tested by that rigorous scrutiny which they must in due time undergo.

In itself, too, the work is full of interest and will well repay any one who cares to peruse the few pages of which it consists. It is a veritable voice from the first ages of the Church which here speaks to us. It is not a treatise addressed to a circle of educated readers, nor even a homily revised for publication; but a sermon couched in the homely rough language in which it was preached. In it we can still hear the faithful shepherd of his flock reproving, entreating and rebuking. And he is speaking to his hearers with that note of authority which has been the characteristic of the Catholic Church in all ages—that authority which her enemies cannot understand, and which the sects who have left her dare not imitate. He was probably a man of no social position, nor was he, as far as we can judge, a highly educated man. Yet he bids his flock listen to his warnings and obey them at their souls' peril, for he is the successor of the apostles and speaks as the representative of Christ.

G. H. Joyce, S. J.

St. Beuno's College, St. Asaph, North Wales.

THE GREEK TEMPLES IN SICILY.

PROBABLY most visitors to Sicily enter the island at Palermo, to which a daily service of steamers runs from Naples. On arrival there the luxury of comfort, perfection of climate, beauty of scenery and the riches of Saracenic and Norman art all combine to beguile the traveler, so that he lends a willing ear to the Siren-song to "quit all hope of further progress" and makes his sojourn there absorb most of the time at his disposal. Yet all true travel should be the means of furnishing the mind with an aftermath of instruction, and if this motive arouses the will to activity, there are few spots upon this earth within so narrow a limit that are so full of remuneration to intelligent enterprise as Sicily affords us. No well-read man can go there and not find his mind excited by a keen interest at the historic scenes this small island will recall to his memory, scenes that will take him back to the days of Troy, the voyages of Ulysses, of the mythology of those times, and which carry the memory on in continuous current through the palmy days of Greece and Rome, Carthage and Byzantium, until the stream becomes mingled with Arab and Norman, French, Spanish and modern Italian. Even the great headland at Palermo, now known as the Mount of Pilgrims, has upon its summit the traces of the camp of Hamilcar Barca (Barak), and this will set in motion a train of enquiry which will follow you all round the island, and produce reminiscences of school reading which still need solution and elucidation. Who were the men this general commanded, this race who have left their memorial on every shore from Syria's strand to Cornwall, from Sicily, Spain and Southern France to Rhodesia in South Africa? We have called them Phœnicians as the Roman did Pœni, and the Greeks Phoinikes from the palm trees that marked their settlements; others named them Sidonians, Tyrians or Cathaginians from their towns, while to the Israelites they were Canaanites or "dwellers in the lowlands." But who they were or whence they came as a race is still an unsolved riddle. They were the first of all early commercial peoples, we believe, and Homer's epithet for them is that of a race "skilled in trickery." Here to this lovely Sicilian land they came bringing with them their Eastern instruments of music and fabrics of matchless purple, and here on every "high place" they reared their temples to cruel and insatiable Ashtaroth, or Astarte and kindled their fires to the blood-stained Moloch.

It is not, however, the signs of Phœnician or Carthaginian occupation that we now propose to trace, although this might be made

the subject of singularly interesting investigation and serious reflection for modern peoples who seem to be setting up commerce as their national deity; we are about to visit the remains left by a succeeding race of higher ideals and nobler aspirations, and one to which the human race will ever owe the debt of its gratitude. From Palermo we can now go by the railway to the Greek temples at Segesta, Selinunte and Girgenti, so that the difficulty of access no longer remains, and although especial provision has to be made for a visit to the two first mentioned, yet at the last we shall find a hotel as delightful as the Hotel des Palmes at Palermo itself.

Most of us have never seen a Greek temple save in pictures, and desire to look upon the reality even though it be battered by the buffets of time, for that is a far less cruel fate than falling into the hands of the adapter or modern type of "restorer." Let us then start first for Segesta, to within five miles' ride of which the train will take us, landing us in a part of the country reputed to have been the settlement of the very descendants of the fugitives from Troy itself. What one barters for the five hours in the train (although the distance be but little over fifty miles!) is the acquaintance with the old roadways over wild mountains with gorgeous scenery and exhilarating air; yet these are not entirely wanting even to the ease-loving traveler of to-day. You round the base of Mount Pellegrino, where within a cave so lately as 1664 were discovered the remains of Sta. Rosalia, niece of the Norman William the Good—

> That grot where olives nod,
> Where, darling of each heart and eye,
> From all the youths of Sicily
> St. Rosalie retired to God.
>
> Marmion i., 23.

Then skirting the beauteous Bay of Castellamare for half its circuit the line strides inland and you alight beneath the precipitous front of Calatafimi. The name is better known now for the victory which Garibaldi here gained in 1860 over the Bourbon troops, but to us it is the boundary of those venerable travelers whose wanderings we revel in during school days as told by Virgil in his entrancing song. Here, taking mule or carriage, you thread a valley through which runs the stream Scamander—so named by the colonists in memory of that of their native land. Egesta, later Segesta, was one of their most important cities; now it is nearly as barren a waste as Troy itself. Once it had a teeming population and great riches, for this very stream ran ensanguined with the blood of 10,000 of its inhabitants, slain by Agathocles of Syracuse to obtain their treasures.

As we advance soon the great temple comes in sight upon our left, and it is a picture never likely to be forgotten. In appearance

it is unquestionably the grandest for general effect of all the temples that remain *erect* in Sicily. It stands at the end of a long, broad valley, upon the natural pedestal of an isolated mountain spur, on the brink of a profound precipice, a site chosen with that wisdom of artistic perception which never failed the Grecian architect. Wild and lonesome heights surround it on every side, bare in the extreme. In a wilderness of wandering mountains and savage cliffs, where all is depth and height, the temple of Segesta rises yellow, majestic and solitary. Its awful desolateness strikes awe and even terror into the mind of the beholder. The silence adds to the impressiveness of the picture; the absence of all signs of human life, the stillness, the sky unflecked with cloud, the sun with its powerful light and heat all seem to urge the valley into slumber. There comes upon one the sense of an oppressing, overpowering Necessity or Fate against which all effort of resistance is futile; the immensity of Time in which the span of human life is so minute a fraction, the boundlessness of Space in which this world is such an atom—all these seem forced upon the mind's emotions.

On ascending one hill you see in the distance Eryx, standing like a sentinel of the Western coast, where was the shrine of Astarte, Aphrodite, Venus—which you will; the sea glitters in the sun at another point, while the eye ranges with glorious sweeps of vision over a saddened, melancholy, weird and fearful panorama. Nought is to be heard save the breeze as it soughs among ruins or rustles the thistles and wild fennel at our feet; the butterfly aimlessly drifts hither and thither and comes across the eye like a silent monitor of the shortness of man's day and the infirmity of his purpose, or like some soul of the dead, as the peasantry believe, to revisit its old home. Birds of prey hover in the serene and silent sunlight like omens of approaching evil, and one treads the ground as if it were a cemetery paved with the tombs of the dead, so solemn and oppressive is the spot. You stand on one hill of ruins, amongst which a theatre has been excavated from the rocky sides, and in which only tragedies would now seem suitable to be enacted, and you gaze across a ravine to another hill where the temple crowns a precipitous crest, while again you see beyond still another height also strewn with the stones of edifices. Amid so much desolation we turn gratefully to a testimony of that eternal truth that never dies, a witness to man's best nature in his strivings after God, and a sign that earnest effort is never wholly lost.

The Doric temple that is the object of our visit is one of the best preserved in Sicily, for its stone is less corroded than in the others. Its thirty-six huge columns—six in front and back and fourteen on either side—have never been finished and are still unfluted, and

hence there is a heavy appearance about them. At their base they are nearly seven feet in diameter, and the height of the column nearly five times this diameter. It is raised upon a stylobate or platform of four high steps, but these are unhewn, and the cella or sanctuary was not even begun, so that this temple can never have been used for worship. It is 192 feet long by 77 or 78 feet wide, or inclusive of the steps, 200 feet by 85 feet. The entablature is nearly entire all round, and the present government has taken praiseworthy care to maintain by iron rods the architrave, whose enormous blocks span from column to column. It must have been begun before B. C. 409, but the continual quarrelling with the Greek town of Selinus, or Selinunte, over fifty miles south of this, to assist the inhabitants against which was the cause of the Carthaginian, and four years previously (B. C. 413) of the Athenian, invasion, must have impeded its progress. The city, however, continued to exist long after its antagonist was destroyed, and we have a vivid picture in Cicero of how a Roman prætor was able to misuse his power, to which an event here furnished an illustration. The people of Segesta possessed a statue of Artemis, or Diana, in brass, "not only invested with most sacred character," he says, "but also wrought with the most exquisite skill and beauty, so that it seemed even to enemies worthy of being religiously worshiped" (*in Verrem*, xxxiii). It had been carried off by the Carthaginians, but was brought back and restored to the city by Publius Scipio Africanus on the taking of Carthage. It was replaced in Segesta amid the joy and delight of the citizens and was "worshiped by them, visited by all strangers, and when I (Cicero) was quæstor it was the very first thing they shewed me." But Verres, "that enemy of all sacred things, the violator of all religious scruples, saw it" and ordered the magistrates to pull it down and give it to him. They did all in their power to resist, but entreaties and opposition were futile. He oppressed the city to such a degree that eventually, subdued by ill-treatment and fear, they had to save themselves by letting their treasure go. Even then no Segestan could be found to do the evil work of the prætor and dislodge the statue from its pedestal, and barbarians had to be brought from Lilybæum (the modern Marsala) before it was removed.

Egesta was an unfortunate town, and if we translate its name by the Latin for poverty we may still find an appropriateness in the title, for nothing can exceed the misery of its few present inhabitants or the squalor and brutality of the life that prevails. The old inhabitants found the name so full of ill-luck that they changed the name to Segesta during the first Punic war, but the blessing of the corn field was not for them, and it remains to this day profoundly impressive in its history and its desolation.

We can continue our journey by rail from this temple to within eight miles of the next celebrated spot, viz., Selinunte, for which Castelveltrano is the nearest station, and here we shall find ourselves upon the western limits of the power of the ancient Greeks. This, their frontier town, is not only memorable for possessing the relics of the grandest temples in Europe, but for its siege by the Carthaginians in B. C. 409, when the stubborn bravery of its people held out against Hannibal Giscon and his 100,000 men for ten days. The descendants of the Tyrian at Carthage were summoned by the descendants of Troy at Segesta to give them help against Selinunte; landing at Lilybæum, the present Marsala, about thirty-five miles away, they marched straight on Selinus. Help was sent to the beleaguered town from Syracuse, but arrived too late, and of its 24,000 inhabitants only a tenth are said to have escaped to Girgenti. And here let us note that it was the "eternal Eastern question" that is the keynote of the history of ancient Sicily, as it is so frequently still that of Europe. It was Greece fighting against the Phœnician, Roman against Carthaginian, Norman against Saracen. As Freeman says, Sicily was the "breakwater" between the Eastern and Western divisions of the Mediterranean, and surely we owe a debt of gratitude to the brave little island for withstanding each attempt to wrest it from Europe. Her 500 years of Greek rule may be regarded as a single-handed combat with Orientalism, and even though at a later date Sicily became for 200 years a province of Africa, yet at the bidding of the Norman she again shook herself free and set herself in the forefront of the battle between Christendom and Islam. It was here at Selinunte that Africa began its most serious attacks upon Europe, and it was here in this "Village of Idols," as they termed it, that in later times the Moslem made his longest stand against King Roger. Christian hermits taking abode here after the Arab expulsion have left behind them their signs upon its stones to testify to the triumph of the Cross against the faith of Mahomet.

Although the remains at Selinus are simply tremendous and present the most remarkable mass of ruins in Europe, yet they do not render the pleasure we should anticipate, since there is not a perfect column erect, and the mind has to reconstruct out of these gigantic heaps the glorious structures that Grecian art spread upon these hills. On one eminence are three important temples and on another three large ones and one small,* the last a temple *in antis, i. e.*, consisting only of a cella with columns in front. Between the two hills is a valley through which a small stream makes its way to the sea, and whose sides are strewn with the stones of the city. The mouth

* They measure, including steps, 139 feet by 60 feet, 230 feet by 88 feet, 192 feet by 89 feet, 28½ feet by 15 feet.

of the stream now choked up with sand and water plants was once the harbor still called the Marinella di Selinunte, but this once well drained valley, the work, it is said, of the wise Empedocles of Girgenti, is now a swamp, and the monument to his memory erected by grateful citizens has its fragments removed to the Museum of Palermo.

Selinus stood on two plateaus formed by the spurs of the mountains as they descend to the coast, and between them is the valley or Gorgo di Cotone, of which we have spoken. The more western of these spurs was occupied by the Acropolis with the town at its rear, the whole enclosed by walls, while the eastern plateau was a sacred precinct without any secular buildings attached. At first sight the mass of ruins seems so chaotic that it appears hopeless to describe them. Sixty mighty columns lie on the earth like regiments of overturned ninepins. In their stupendous ruin and desolation they are appalling, and from their colossal size deserve their local title of *I pillieri dei giganti.* The largest of the temples on the Acropolis hill, supposed to have been dedicated to Hercules, had seventeen columns on either side and a double row in front; those on its northern side have fallen outward and lie in regular order, the drums of the shafts disjointed, but section above section, and beyond these come the huge blocks of architrave, frieze and cornice, as if awaiting the mason to fit them together. Those on the southern side have fallen inwards and crushed the cella in their descent, a grievous scene of destruction. Some of the pillars were monoliths, but usually they are composed of six separate blocks. They vary in diameter, but were 28 feet in height. They have not the usual number of flutes (viz., twenty), those in the portico having 16 and the others 18. Another diversity in this temple to most others is the great narrowness of the cella or sanctuary compared to its length, for while the length of this temple, inclusive of the steps, is 230 feet and breadth 88 feet, the cella is 131 feet by 30 feet. This once magnificent structure stood upon a stylobate or platform of four steps, but was approached in front by an additional nine. It is the oldest of the shrines raised by the Selinuntans and is thought to have been erected soon after their settlement here in B. C. 628. In the interesting Museum at Palermo are preserved portions of its entablature and three of its metopes which must have been executed at the same time. Copies of them are in the British Museum, for they are precious as illustrating the earliest period of Doric sculpture in the island. They are without beauty, but although stiff and grotesque they contain evidence of the earnest effort to portray vigorous life; they are not conventional, for it is a struggle in the fetters of archaic tradition; there is a freedom and hopefulness in them that makes

them highly interesting and important to the student of art, for notwithstanding their uncouthness they are the work of early genius and unique. Their exaggeration of limb and feature is startling when seen in a museum. As Gothic carvings made to stand high above the beholder, when viewed near by are appallingly hideous and distorted, yet from beneath appear graceful and suitable, so these no doubt produced a more effective and chastened aspect when in their lofty position in the frieze. The subjects are, as is usual, derived from ancient myths. One is a conqueror in his four-horsed chariot in almost complete relief, with female figures of Victory holding above his head the laurel crown; another Perseus beheading Medusa, with the Goddess Athena in the background, and the third Heracles and the Cecropes.

Twenty-five yards north of this temple is another which had thirteen fluted columns on each side and six in front, thirty-four in all, whose capitals have enormous projections. The columns taper more than those of the earlier temple near by, and their height is rather more than five times their diameter. Its peristyle or surrounding court of pillars is unwontedly spacious, since the cella here, too, is extremely narrow. It is approached by five steps in front and stands upon a platform of four. Its dedication is unknown. There is the small temple *in antis*, as it is termed, to the south of the most ancient one of Heracles, and beyond this, above the waters of the African sea that beat against the rock a hundred feet below, is another large one that stood upon a stylobate of four steps and had thirty-six columns of twenty flutes each, but not one of which is now entire.

The eastern hill, nearly a mile away, was made a sacred enclosure in the sixth century B. C. The stupendous remains of its three temples are all together, facing east and west, the most northern thought to have been dedicated to Apollo, the most southern to Hera, but the deity of the intervening one is unknown, and of its columns only a few sections remain. The temple of Hera had an approach of eleven steps and stylobate of four; it measures with steps 228 feet by 91 feet and had fifteen columns on either side, six in front, and of these portions of three alone stand erect. Disjointed they lie like those of Heracles on the opposite hill, ranged on the ground, appealing to the generosity of the learned societies of Europe to restore them and thus do honor to our new century. The porticoes have fallen outwards. Metopes from this temple are also at Palermo and mark a period when the art of sculpture was at its highest development and perfection. Their subjects are Athena slaying the giant Enceladus, whom Zeus placed beneath Ætna; Heracles slaying the Amazon Hippolyta; Zeus and Hera on Mount

Ida; Artemis and Actæon. The skill evinced in their composition and execution is not so great as that which characterized the best Attic art, but is still of a very high order. The female figures have the exposed part of the body inlaid with white marble, but there is a lack of the freedom of action and drapery that we have learnt from the schools of Greece. Yet the progress from the work of the Metopes of Heracles to those of Hera is astonishing.

The northernmost of these three temples is one of the largest Grecian temples known. Like those of Egesta it was left unfinished. Its huge columns are unfluted, and it would seem not to have had the full number intended, as others were being quarried when the work was arrested. It differs from other temples here in being octastyle peripteral instead of the usual hexastyle, *i. e.*, it had eight columns in front and rear and a row on either side, making forty-six altogether. It was probably dedicated to Apollo, as an inscription found in it indicates. Measuring 371 feet by 177 feet, it exceeds in length all others in the island, but is surpassed in area by one at Girgenti. The height of its columns was 53½ feet and their diameters taper from 11¼ feet to 6¼ or 8 feet. Shaken down by some convulsion of nature that destroyed so many of these marvelous buildings, the heaped up columns and entablature form a "most stupendous and sublime mound of ruins," and one sighs for some effort to be made to replace its stones.

A visit to the quarries whence the material for these temples was taken will be made by all who are capable of feeling the peculiar help that it gives the imagination to be actually in touch with the vanished workman. Like the pleasure afforded the beholder by seeing the very marks of the Egyptian draughtsman for his design on the walls of some of the tombs of the Kings at Thebes, or by the sight of the more recently opened houses in Pompeii, where the authorities have wisely left everything in its original place and not removed it to a museum, so in these quarries we may easily perceive the actual method of work and picture the laborer at his toil. Indeed it needs in this case little effort to annihilate centuries and to think that the workmen have gone to their meal and will presently return, instead of the truth that they have for over 2,000 years been wrapped in their long siesta. They were evidently hewing and shaping these mighty drums for the pillars of Apollo's temple out of this limestone rock when the cry arose that the Carthaginian was upon them and his hosts approaching along the Lilybæum road. They had to leave incontinently and fly across the moorland towards the fortified Acropolis five miles away. Some had been transporting those finished sections of the columns that now lie at the foot of the quarry, and you may trace others along the road to Selinus and almost see the patient oxen slowly dragging the heavy wooden trolley upon

which one was placed. The news comes that the enemy is at hand on this Campobello road where we are, the men hastily unyoke the creamy white buffaloes and drive them before them, but others only seek safety for themselves and leave their teams, which remain dreamily standing in the sun flicking their heavy tails across their flanks, indifferent to the human catastrophe that is being enacted around them. The invaders come up and under new masters there is no cessation, but only an alteration of toil for the captured beasts, and they are employed for the purposes of the transport of the army. There probably on the roadway the cart and its load stood and rotted, and there you may see the stones of Apollo which have lain from that day until this.

Selinus is spoken of by Virgil as "*palmosa Selinus,*" and it is hard to realize this amid the bareness and desolateness of the present city, but a dwarf fan-palm is very abundant, the only species native to Europe, and perhaps this is what he refers to. The city is said to have taken its name from the plant *(selinos)* sacred to Heracles, to whom the first temple was reared. It is commonly spoken of as parsley, but it was not our culinary vegetable, and it is doubtful what was meant. We know that it was some fragrant herb used in festival garlands, at funeral rites or as the wreath of victory in the games of the Corinthian isthmus, and some have thought that it might be the wild celery that grows freely here, but this is too interesting a subject to deal with.

To see the next group of Sicilian temples we must go eastwards to Girgenti, about sixty-eight miles off, and we may avoid returning to Palermo to obtain the direct line of railway thither if we will drive along the new road that will take us there in nineteen hours. A railway is projected, but if we drive we can break our journey at Sciacca la degna (24 miles), and the road which passes through vineyards and cornfields and along the sands of the Libyan Sea is useful in affording an insight into outlying districts of the island. We shall leave to the left the quarries at Menfrici from whose rock the metopes of the temples at Selinus seem to have come. From the highlands we shall catch a view of the island of Pantellaria, between which and the mainland arose on 18th of July, 1831, a volcanic island of four or five miles' circumference, only to disappear as mysteriously on the 18th of January of the next year. Now the coral fishers are busy near its site. Spots will recall to our mind every varying race and visitor that has been connected with this fair land from the mythic Daedalus to Norman Roger, until we reach the modern Porto Empedocle within four miles by a rail of the towering heights of Girgenti, the Greek Acragas and Roman Agrigentum.

No Sicilian city is more nobly situated than this—the towns of Castro-giovanni, or Enna, and Taormina alone compete with it. Whether approached by sea or land it is equally grand and striking. The lofty chain of rock rising precipitously from the northern lowlands, but descending in terraces and rolling slopes like mighty waves to the south, is composed of cockle, scallop, oyster, whelk and other shell and marine deposit, and seems like a huge wall raised by Neptune or some god of the ocean to guard from the sea some spot where his nymphs might play and his Nereids slumber. In billow upon billow of gray and purple hill it mounts up until the long steep ridge of its citadel stands forth over 1,200 feet in height against a background of serene and violet sky. Imagination can scarcely form an exaggerated picture of what a glorious vision it must have presented when with its Acropolis intact at one end of the ridge and the mighty temple of the Parthenon upon its Rupe Atenea at the other and adorned with long lines of the finest monuments of Grecian art upon its terraced front it looked down upon the southern sea. It is singularly unlike other Greek colonies in Sicily in being withdrawn from the water, but the seaboard, with its harbors and fleets, never had any attraction for the company of Dorian settlers that came here. They were a pastoral and agricultural people, worshipers of Demeter rather than Poseidon. They were also lovers of horses, and this interest they probably first brought to Sicily, if the chariot-loving Phœnician had not done so previously, and it continues still a trait in the island's character. Many a Sicilian steed won the Olympic and Pythian crown for the lords of Acragos and Syracuse. Diodorus records with enthusiasm the numerous chariots of the people of this city and the world renowned breed of steeds that carried everything before them in the games of ancient Hellas. We have, moreover, the name at least of one, viz., Phrenicos, that won the prize in the seventy-third Olympian games for Hiero of Syracuse in the entries for single racers. Thus the popular taste was much more directed to their inland plains than to the sea, which they sadly neglected. Not that there was any natural harbor on their coast, but people who could raise such temples as they did could easily have made a haven if they had wished to do so. The degenerate modern inhabitant is actually doing this and using for it some of the precious stones of which the ancient Greek was the hewer. May Neptune and all the gods avenge themselves on such sacrilege!

The preference for the horse, I have said, is still a marked characteristic of the island. The Arab domination for 200 years, no doubt, has helped to continue it from earlier date, but just as in Italy and southern lands you most frequently meet with oxen, mules, asses

and donkeys as the beasts of burthen, so here you find the horse. Camels were once common as they were in Gaul and exist occasionally still in parts of Spain and in the neighborhood of Pisa, but they have now disappeared in Sicily. The Agrigentines ought to have taken the horse as their badge, but they perversely chose a crab, not that they appreciated salt water, but because that creature's form of dwelling seemed to typify their own ridged home on the seashore. Later they chose an eagle when their pride soared high after their victory at Himera, and finally they have adopted a Telamon or Gigante from a rebus upon their modern name of Girgenti.

Acragas and Syracuse were by far the most prosperous of all the Greek colonies in Sicily, and far outstripped the others in magnificence and wealth. Acragas was ten miles round, and divided into five townships, of which the present city occupies but one, and that the oldest. In the number of its ancient divisions and in its present shrinkage to one, and this the first chosen, it resembles its great compeer, modern Syracuse. The goats now feed upon the Rock of Athena; oliveyards and orchards of fig, lemon and orange cover the ancient quarters known by the names of Agrigentum, Agrigentum in Camico and Neapolis; rolling fields and garden enclosures have erased the once busy Agora and its paved and pillared ways, and the earthy deposit of the centuries now covers the dwellings of its nobles.

In shape it was quadrangular, the side tilted up to the top of the high chain of rock we have spoken of and then coming down towards the seashore. The approach therefore from the south displays the whole city before us. The temples all seem to have clustered on this side, and if the position of those still erect be singularly striking and grand, how far surpassing these must have been the grandeur of the Parthenon that once stood, not on this lower terrace of rocky barrier forming the city's wall, but upon the lofty crest of the Rupe Atenea rising 1,240 feet in air. Alas! all that remains of this temple is the stepped platform or stylobate upon which the wise builders of those times always placed their work, as we give a pedestal to any object of especial artistic value. It is not quite certain whether it was dedicated to the goddess whose name it now bears and whose sacred trees surround her throne, but it is most probable. Far out to sea would the mariner have been able to see the shrine of the deity that had a dwelling so high. Simple and unadorned though its architecture would be, it would be imposing, majestic and inspiring. Greek genius displayed itself in selecting such elevated spots as this whereon to fix the witness of his worship, the tribute of his piety and the embodiment of his skill. By

their beauty and dignity he raised in the mind a sense of awe and reverence and in the heart of the departing child of Hellas a yearning for the protection of his gods and a love of his native land.

As we approach from the seaside we pass a few remains of the Temple of Æsculapius that once contained the famous statue of Apollo, "on whose thigh there was the name of Myron inscribed in diminutive silver letters" (*Cic. in Verr. xliii.*), and which was stolen finally by Verres the prætor. Then just without the walls is the later tomb of the wise ruler Theron, and we enter the city by a sunk road at the Porta Aurea, by which Carthaginian and Roman have passed. We have immediately upon our left the temple of Zeus, and on the right we stand beneath the posticum of that of Heracles. The king of the gods and the king of heroes were thus placed as warders of this, the main entrance to the city, and remiss those porters must have been or sadly lukewarm their suppliants to have permitted so many enemies to gain access to ancient Acragas. We turn at once to the left and we are amid the huge remains of the temple of Zeus, begun about 480 B. C. and finished all but the roof, if that were intended to be finished, in 406 B. C., when Carthage took the town. It was not only the largest temple raised by Acragentines or other Sicilian colonists, but the largest ever attempted by the Greek architect anywhere, and worthily dedicated to the king of the gods himself. It may be that the Ionic temple of Diana at Ephesus exceeded this in size, but it is difficult to ascertain the dimensions of that temple so entire was its destruction, but some authorities give its length as 388 feet by 187 feet, while this of Zeus is 363 feet by 182 feet. This that we are now considering was a heptastyle, *i. e.*, seven columns in front; it was also pseudo-peripteral, *i. e.*, its surrounding columns did not stand free, but the wall was built up between them, the huge weight of the entablature making this necessary. Diodorus states that the "columns were built up in the same mass as the wall and all rounded externally, but with a square face to the interior of the temple," and this wall was pierced with windows. It differed in plan from all others in Sicily, for this outer walled and pillared enclosure was succeeded by a second one similar to it inside, and then came the cella within this, so that it was something like one of those Oriental boxes fitting one within another! Diodorus also gives the height to the top of the portico, exclusive of the basement, as 120 feet, so that it must have had a row of columns above the lower range. In length and width it must have been as large as St. Paul's Cathedral, London, and covered an area as large as that of Cologne Cathedral! Great portions of the side walls have fallen down, their stones lying in their relative positions. Those that remain of its thirty-seven or thirty-eight enormous pillars lie prostrate like a regi-

ment mowed down by some destructive artillery. Some of these measure nearly fifteen feet in diameter and have flutings twenty inches in breadth and deep enough to permit a man to stand within their groove. They rose fifty-five feet in height and their capitals are mighty blocks weighing at least twenty tons! Figures are very unsatisfactory to convey to the mind any conception of the real character of such a huge edifice as this must have been. Moreover, all measurements of buildings are never very accurate, being most difficult to obtain, and can only be approximate; still Polybius, Diodorus and other ancient writers give minute descriptions of this temple, whose magnificence they extol. Amidst the universal ruin lie colossal figures of Atlantes twenty-five feet in height that once stood before the pilasters of the cella, it may be, and one of these monsters has been reconstructed on the ground and lies like the mighty figure of Rameses II. at Memphis, only in thirteen disjointed blocks. The brown, weird giant is carved, too, in the severe style of Egypt with arms raised and stretched out, and seems like some Samson in the temple of the Philistines, who has gathered about him as his sepulchre the ruins of the great shrine in which he has been derided and has laid himself down in the midst of the catastrophe which he has created for the long sleep of the centuries.

Up to 1401 a considerable part of this temple was standing, but eventually earthquakes succeeded in dislodging its noble entablatures, capitals and columns, since no assistance had been given to the sterling art of the mason for eighteen centuries. In modern time the miserable mind of man has only been directed as to how best to transport stones that mock his imbecility in order to cast them into the sea to form a mole at the port of Empedocles, and this is the reason why the remains seem scant for so vast a structure.

From the elevation of the environing walls of the ancient temenos of the temple we look across gardens and undulating fields and may notice the piscina or fish pond mentioned by Diodorus with remains of the famous Cloacæ of Phæax. To the right are seen four Doric columns reërected by M. Cavallari, which recall a temple, probably that of Castor and Pollux, that once stood here, but these are all that remain of its thirty-four columns. Further on, where the ancient walls run by the side of the river Hypsas, are the stones of what is termed the temple of Vulcan, but there is little to induce the visitor to visit them.

Leaving the temple of Zeus we made our way along the ridge of rock that formed the city's bulwark, and have a succession of remarkable buildings. First comes the temple of Heracles, now like its fellow warder of the Golden Gate, utterly overthrown save one

solitary column. The disjointed stones of its pillars lie bleaching upon the ground like the articulations of some monster skeleton of pre-historic periods. In size and plan it must have resembled the Athenian Parthenon. The latter was 228 feet long without its steps; this was 241 feet with them. The Parthenon was 101 feet wide; this was ninety feet. The Parthenon was octastyle-peripteral, *i. e.*, with eight columns in front and rows on either side; this was hexastyle-peripteral, with only six. The height of the columns of Athene's temple is just over thirty-four feet, these thirty-three feet; their diameter in the former is more than six feet at the base, here it is seven feet. Here there are but thirty-eight Doric shafts; at Athens there are very many more, both large and small. It must, however, have been the most effective in appearance of all the temples of Acragas, next indeed to that of Zeus in position and size; it probably exceeded it in beauty. It is the earliest of all of them, as shown by the short and rapidly diminishing shaft, widespread abacus or capital and the bold curve of the echinus immediately below. Its restoration in Roman times did not improve it. Its sacred cella has an arrangement that is probably of this time, for it is quite unique, making it to consist of three chambers adjoining each other at the back. Xeuxis presented to this temple his famous picture of Alcmene, the mother of its hero-deity, for which he said he could accept no remuneration because it was priceless. Here, too, was the bronze statue of Heracles, another of those which "that man Verres" tried to carry off. A vivid description is given of the attempt by Cicero in his oration against the prætor. "There is a temple of Hercules at Agrigentum," he says, "not far from the forum, considered very holy and greatly reverenced among the citizens. In it there is a brazen image of Hercules himself, than which I cannot easily tell where I have seen anything finer; so greatly reverenced that his mouth and chin are a little worn away because men in addressing their prayers and congratulations to him are accustomed not only to worship the statue, but even to kiss it." Verres suddenly sent out a band of armed slaves one stormy night to attack the temple. The watchmen and guardians within its sacred precincts raise the alarm and endeavor to stop the invaders, but are driven in by bludgeons and stones; the bolts are forced, the doors are dashed in and they begin to endeavor to pull the statue off the pedestal, part of which may still be seen. They are pulling at it with ropes and making holes for their levers to get a purchase when the news is noised abroad. "No one in Agrigentum was either so advanced in years or so infirm in strength as not to rise up on that night, awakened by the tidings, and to seize whatever weapon chance put into his hands." They hurry to this temple, where for an hour the scoundrels had been

doing their best to overthrow the statue. The citizens rush in; the sacred close of the temple yard, lighted up with torches and lanterns, resounds with yells and blows, and eventually the robbers are driven away. Thus the statue was preserved from the infamous Verres, and "the Sicilians, who are never in such distress as not to be able to say something facetious and neat," remarked on this occasion that Hercules had added a fresh labo. to those already accomplished, since he had conquered another boar (Verres—a boar) in the person of the prætor in addition to that of Erymanthus!

About three hundred yards further on in the same direction we come in succession to the two great temples that are erect, and if it be the first time that the visitor has seen one not a ruinous mass of stone, it will be a moment of thrilling enjoyment. Here we can trace for ourselves the cause of the effect produced in the mind without guessing at reconstruction. We feel at once the force of the beautiful law of proportion that pervades the whole, the exquisite simplicity, the natural sense of rhythmical beauty that must have been instinct to the builders, and this to an extent scarcely comprehensible to us. All this is so acutely and sensitively embodied in these stones that we naturally leave the language of architecture for that of its sister arts of literature and music and can only describe our feelings in such terms as a poem, a melody, an epic or a symphony; and after all it is rhythm that gives *form* to music and Scripture alike. Nor can we be in the presence of such works as these without being tempted to trace the intellectual and national disposition of the Greek mind as shown in the art they have bequeathed to us to the language they employed. To see how their conception of Order (*κόσμος*) is a convertible term with Beauty, as also with the great Universe of which we form a part, how to fulfil our appointed share in this universal order Beauty and Goodness must be intimately related (*καλοκἀγαθία*), how the Happy man is he who stands well with his God (*εὐδαιμονία*), or even how Truth in word or work is incapable of oblivion (*ἀλήθεια*). Cannot we also see in the sublimely passionless, cold and statuesque character of these temples the same supreme sense of abstractedness that we feel in the characters of their ancient drama? The persons come before us as the creature of some stern, relentless Necessity, spell-bound by some mysterious power that fetters their free-will, impelling them to their doom. Religion was the source of their drama as it was of their art, and the frigidity of spirit, a certain uniformity or sameness, a certain recurrence of thought and expression, that pervade at least some of the realms of their ancient literature seem reproduced in their architecture. The humanity that pervades Gothic architecture is lacking in classic; in fact, is it not ethically the difference between the dread

goddess Ananké, Necessity or Fate, and the Christian doctrine of Free-Will? But to our subject.

The first of these temples is dedicated to a goddess of whose presence the men of Acragas were sadly in need, viz., Concordia, one of the charities of social life that seems to have been the most difficult for them to acquire, for in the checkered history of their town when it was not external attack that they had to combat it was perpetual internal dissension. The fair goddess of Concord must have sadly hardened her heart, for her votaries evidently charmed very sweetly to her in this temple. If the almighty Zeus and the god-like hero Heracles had as an offering the most extensive works of their hands, it was to Concord they raised the most completely beautiful and perfect specimen of Greek architecture extant on the island and perhaps in Europe. Harmonious and loveable as such a deity's shrine should be, it stands 138 feet long by 64 in width, with its thirty-four yellow sandstone shafts erect, six in front and rear and eleven on either side, with a circumference tapering from fifteen to nine feet and about twenty-three in height. Above them rise complete both architrave and pediments, and except it be the Theseum at Athens no more complete Doric temple is existing. Situated on the edge of the steep ridge of rock that forms the natural bulwark of the ancient city, it spoke aloud for peace, peace to invading Carthaginian and Roman as well as to the men of the once crowded Agora at its side; but alas! there was no peace. Yet we probably owe its preservation to times when all those who had reared its finished beauty had long passed away, when the lords of the height and the moiling crowds of the mart were alike hushed in death, when the market place had become an oliveyard and the paved streets terraces for fig and vine, and there arose another people who placed here the altar of the God of Peace Himself, choosing as their daysman the husbandman's patron saint of St. Gregory of the Turnips! Its sacred cella remains the most perfect in the island, its side walls pierced with circular openings made when it was used as a church, and instead of blaming Christianity for adapting temples to its uses as the too eager antiquary is often prompted to do, he should remember to be grateful at least here. In A. D. 399 Arcadius and Honorius commanded all the Greek temples to be destroyed and used to repair bridges, roads, city walls, aqueducts and the like, but those that could be used by the Christian communities were to be exempted from this decree. Our regret therefore should be that the Church did not take more of them than it did.

A walk of half a mile further on takes us along a road bordered by the ancient wall hewn out of the natural rock which Virgil saw from the sea (*Æn. iii., 703*), and this is honeycombed with niches

and tombs on its inner face now bereft of their marbles and their ashes. We come to the temple that is rather hesitatingly styled that of Juno Lacinia, magnificently situated at the southeast corner of the city's circuit, on the highest point of this rocky terrace that forms the last step down from the soaring crest of the Acropolis. The steep precipitous edge upon which it is placed is 390 feet above the level of the African sea that lies glittering in the sun 2½ miles away, yet looking far nearer; and here the temple is raised upon a lofty stylobate or platform with a grand flight of steps leading to its eastern portico, and huge masses of the city wall upon its southern side. It is slightly earlier in date than that of Concord, very slightly smaller and in a less perfect condition. It is similar in design and in the number of its columns, but of these twenty-five only are now complete, the remainder being but half columns, and these reërected. Those on the south have been mainly injured by the scirocco blowing across the Mediterranean from the African deserts, and are more deteriorated than those on the north, which remain perfect, while little of the entablature is left. A portion of the pedestal upon which stood the statue of the goddess still is seen in the nave, and in front of this seats are observable for the purpose of viewing the sacrifice made to her. Sometimes this temple is called that of the Virgins, the reason given being that Xeuxis was asked to paint for it a picture of the Queen of the Gods and chose for his models five maidens of Girgenti from whom to form a perfect figure; but there is probably a confusion with a temple to Juno at Croton and a picture of Helen of Troy.

These temples are lighter in proportion than those of Egesta and Selinus and are therefore probably a little later in date. Diodorus states that they were all erected by means of the money obtained by the sale of the city's olive oil at Carthage, while the captives made in B. C. 480 (about the date of the temple of Juno) at the battle of Himera provided so large a number of slaves that they were no doubt employed in this work. Some of the citizens are said to have possessed 500 slaves apiece, and by their labor the subterranean canals, the fish ponds and temples would be formed; for quarrying stone was a very ready means of utilizing prison labor.

It was a saying of the ancients that the "Acragentines built as if they were to live forever and feasted as if they were to die to-morrow," and we may judge for ourselves, now more than 2,000 years after, how true the first part of the epigram was. We are not likely to be able to exceed in imagination the magnificence that this terrace of cathedrals must have displayed when these temples stood fair and perfect within a few yards of each other, nor should we be satisfied with simply inspecting their remains. It is a liberal educa-

tion to sit down amongst them and recall the history also of the wonderful city of which they only formed a part, and little is done if the visitor come but to mark the antithesis that the shrunken modern Girgenti presents to the mighty Acragas. We can scarcely at first realize that it was once the wonder of the island, and unless we have studied the history of the period in which it flourished we are unflushed with the enthusiasm that the scene about us should kindle.

The story of the fine buildings that once abounded at Acragas in the height of its pride, the prosperity and riches of its herding citizens, their affluence in statuary and paintings, the luxury and elegance of their homes are dwelt upon with delight by Diodorus the Sicilian. They had a short life and a luxurious one, but not a peaceful one by any means, for the city presents a singularly checkered career. From its foundation to its overthrow by the daughter of Tyre was only 174 years, and like Tyre, its fall is one of the most appalling disasters recorded in history. Twelve years after its foundation Phalaris, whose name is most familiar for his cruelty, had raised it to so high a pitch of splendor that it ranked at once as the second city of the island, but it rose in magnificence and beauty only to become besotted with luxury and to be finally cast down from the pinnacle of its glory. It allied itself with its conquerors, only to be destroyed by Rome. It transferred its fickle affections to Rome, only to be betrayed again to Carthage, and the intervals it filled up with mutual quarrel and dissension.

Two names will be uppermost in the minds of every visitor to Girgenti, viz., those of Phalaris and Empedocles, not because they are the most worthy of remembrance or the only distinguished ones in its history, but because they are the most romantic; for whilst few recall the wise ruler Theron, whose Romanized tomb is seen without the Golden Gate of the city, every schoolboy knows of Phalaris and his brazen bull and the leap into Ætna of Empedocles. It is unfortunate that the barbarities of Phalaris are so proverbial as to obliterate a due consideration of his ability as a ruler and a recognition that it was to him the city owed its rapid rise to the height of its magnificence. The vague use of the word tyrant is so entirely harmful in popular parlance that it sounds like a contradiction in terms to speak of a "benevolent and just tyrant." Yet in Greek republican days many such existed, for the word only means one who raised himself to kingly and autocratic power when a monarchy was not the recognized form of the Constitution. The cruelty of the tyrant Phalaris has become associated with all tyrants, but quite unjustifiably. Modern critical history is inclined to whitewash all sinners and blacken all saints; but while doing justice to the progress made under Phalaris it has been very doubtful as to the story

of his bull. Yet, as is usually the case with these ancient traditional tales, further investigation confirms them and we are now again told that this one is to be accepted. Pindar, writing only eighty years after the fall of the tyrant, is little likely to have spoken of this instrument of torture unless it had been notorious at the time, and he speaks of

> Phalaris with blood defiled,
> His Brazen Bull, his torturing flame,
> Hand o'er alike to evil fame
> In every clime. Pyth. i., Cary's Trans.

Eventually this bull was carried to Carthage by the victors of Acragas, but restored again by Scipio Africanus, whom Cicero records as having said when he did so that "he thought it reasonable for the Acragentines to consider whether it was more advantageous to the Sicilians to be subject to their own princes or to be under the dominion of the Roman people when they had this as a monument of the cruelty of their domestic masters and of Roman liberality." (*Verres.* V. xxxiii.) The comparison, I fear, was a very weak one, especially with the rapacious and sacrilegious Verres as the representative of Roman generosity. The Castle of Licata, the ancient Phintias, was called Ecnomos the monstrous, from being the place where this bull was kept, but the figure now lies beneath the sands of the sea into which it was hurled. The Sicilian peasant retains it as prominently in his mind as do the youth of England, and you may see depicted upon one side of their pretty country carts the scene of Perillus being cast in the brazen oven with the ruler of Acragas near by, while some sacred story will adorn the second, a ballet dance be upon a third and King Roger fighting the Arab upon the fourth! There seems to have been an importation of Phœnician cruelty in the adoption of this punishment, which was so singularly unlike Greek practice, and perhaps in it we may trace some connection with the bull of the Herculean Melkart and the fires of Moloch. High up on the acropolis beneath the Church of Sta. Maria dei Greci we may see the columns of the most ancient temple in Acragas, within whose walls Phalaris himself may have stood making his offering to Zeus of the Atabyrian hill of Rhodes, while away at Ecnomos the air resounded with the bellowings of the victims of his displeasure.

We have no experience that enables us to vitalize the figure of these ancient despots, the awe and fear they inspired and the manner of their going are alike unknown to us, so that we cannot place them in fancy among the moving throngs about the temples and streets of the city. We probably greatly exaggerate and make quite an over-colored picture in our brain. But it is not so difficult to localize the presence of the philosopher Empedocles, the disciple of

the "long-haired Samian," Pythagoras. We have a part of his literary labors remaining to us and many descriptions indicative of his influence. They show him to have been poet, philosopher, naturalist, physician and philanthropist, yet penetrated with an all-consuming vanity that has made men skeptical as to whether the philosophy exceeded the charlatanism in his character. Roman scorn for all things Greek may have been the source of this, for the coarser fibred Latin had not only national and political prejudices, but a less finely strung mental endowment than the Greek. The Pythagorean was regarded probably as a magician for averting sickness by such simple remedies as modern times have revived, such as improved ventilation and drainage. The cutting through of the crest of the great wall of rock that connected the Acropolis with the Rupe Atenea was, according to local tradition, made by his advice, so that the Tramontana from the north might get through to the town on the south and dispel the malaria occasioned by its stagnant air. We may picture him in his robes of purple, his temples wreathed with the bay leaves of Apollo, and his feet shod with sandals of saffron and (they say) gold, charming a listening throng of the luxurious citizens with his eloquence and his reasoning from the natural world about him, as he sat in the bright sunshine within the precincts of one of these temples. In the beginning of one of his works—the Catharma—in which he urges moral conduct as the best medicine, we seem to see the vanity that has qualified his fame. "An immortal god and no longer a mortal man," he says, "I wander among you, honored by all, adorned with the priestly diadem and blooming garlands. Into whatever famous town I enter men and women do me reverence, and I am accompanied by thousands who thirst for their advantage, some being drawn to know the future and others tormented by long and terrible disease, waiting to hear the spells which will soothe suffering," etc., etc. And thus by the sad irony of fate in both cases—of Phalaris and Empedocles—it is the evil or the weakness in them that has lived the longest! Even in seeking his romantic death it is said that he desired to secretly disappear from amongst men so that, according to Lucian, as Milton says, he

> to be deemed
> A god, leaped fondly into Ætna flames.
>
> Paradise Lost, iii.

But the very cauldron into which he cast himself punished his pride by ejecting one of those attractive sandals that he had been wont to display, and thus revealed the truth.

> Deus immortalis haberi
> Dumcupit Empedocles, ardentem frigidus Ætnam
> Insiluit. Hors. A. P., 464.

In the modern town of Girgenti, three or four miles from the

temples, there is nothing much to delay us. It occupies the ancient Acropolis only and the views from it are wonderfully beautiful and inspiring. The present population is about the same in number as is now that of its old compeer Syracuse, but in its prosperity the latter possessed no less than half a million and this about the same. The 22,000 modern inhabitants number 300 less than those taken prisoners by the Romans in the last siege of B. C. 262, yet children swarm everywhere. It is said to be the most prolific population in Italy or the island, and Fazzello mentions an Agrigentine woman who bore seventy-three children at thirty births! The people are now much employed in the sulphur works, but still we may see prevailing the solid, simple love of agricultural pursuits that marked the first Dorian settlers. But above all the memory will return to its magnificent panorama and to the scenes that are summoned to the stage of the mind's theatre as evening closes in and the sun sinks over western Lilybæum, Drepanum and Eryx; when under the influence of its reflective glamor upon the senses, we repeople again these Libyan waters, the deserted Agora and lonely temples, and we gaze down from the Rock of Athena over Girgenti *la magnifica.*

A. E. P. R. Dowling.

London, England.

MICHAEL SERVETUS AND SOME SIXTEENTH CENTURY EDUCATIONAL NOTES.

FOR centuries before the so-called renascence the University of Paris was a name to conjure with among the educated classes of every country in Europe. Even the greatest of the Minnesingers, Walther von der Vogelweide, in the famous contest on the Wartburg that has been immortalized by Wagner, boasted that he had been at the University of Paris. In the old poem attributed to him, "Die Zwölf Meister zu Paris"—"The Twelve Masters at Paris"—occurs a quotation that is of interest not only because of its reference to the University of Paris, but because it shows how much closer the old German was to the language of the Netherlands and at the same time nearer in many ways to our modern English. The quotation is: "Wil man fragen nach den wisosten pfafen die of ertrich sint die vindet man ze Paris in der schuol." "If a man is looking for the wisest teachers that exist on earth he must go to the schools in Paris."[1]

[1] "Die Universitaet Paris und die Fremden an Derselben im Mittelalter." Von Dr. Alexander Budinszky, Professor an der Universitaet Czernowitz. Berlin: Hertz, 1876.

For centuries Paris deserved the reputation she enjoyed as the great centre of learning. Then, mainly as the result of possessing a sort of monopoly, and having too many privileges conferred on the faculty and too much power placed in their hands so that individual enterprise had no proper stimulus, the University lost much of its usefulness as a teaching institution. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, despite the fact that most of the great scholars of Europe thought it necessary to spend some time at the University of Paris, it does not seem to have been seriously fulfilling its educational mission. L'Abbe Paquier in an article on the University of Paris and the teaching of the humanities at the beginning of the sixteenth century says that there was practically no direct study of the Latin classics. The text-books used in the teaching of Latin were mainly certain works written in that language during the immediately preceding century. The principal ones among these were Despauteres Rudiments, the Floretus, or the Combat, of Thedulus or Theodatulus, and the Distichs of Jean Facetus.[2]

Latin was very commonly talked at the University, but the language in use would surely have made Cicero turn in his grave had he heard it. It was so bad that the German historian of the foreigners at the University of Paris, from whom we have quoted before, speaks of it as Kauderwälsch, an expressive German term for which we have no English equivalent, but whose signification would perhaps be best conveyed to English readers by some such expression as hog Latin, or jargon.

The main business of the University was the interminable discussion of sophistical questions of all kinds. Even law and medicine were taught by the discussion of hypothetical questions founded on the old authors in these branches. Medicine, for instance, was taught by taking a passage from Galen, the interpretation of which might reasonably, or unreasonably, be called into doubt, and then its different significations were discussed and arguments brought forward founded on quotations from other parts of the author's work. When this was true of so practical a subject as medicine, it can be easily understood how the argumentative system formed the basis in all other branches of education.

A quotation from a letter written by a student of the University at the time shows how far this foolish devotion to the disputation system had gone: *"Les inombrables cohortes de sophistes empechent tout progres. Dans une seance on n'en voulait pas peu a Adam de n'avoir pas mangé de poires au lieu de pommes."* "The endless cohorts of sophists prevent all progress at the University. One lecture hour

[2] "Revue des Questions Historiques." New Series. Vol. XX. and XXI.; Article "L'Universite de Paris, et L'Humanisme au Debut," XVI. eme Siecle, par L'Abbe Paquier.

was taken up with the question whether Adam was not to be seriously blamed by his descendants for not having eaten pears in place of apples." This passage occurs in a letter of Glarean's to Erasmus written August the 5th, 1510. It is to be found in the third volume of Erasmus' collected works.

Notwithstanding this unfortunate state of affairs, distinguished scholars still found their way to the University. Sir Thomas, afterwards Blessed Thomas More, having become embroiled with the English King, Henry VIII., by refusing to submit to his will in Parliament, had to resign his seat and found it advisable to spend several years on the Continent. At least one of those years was passed at the University of Paris. This was about 1510. It is interesting to note that he passed some time also at the University of Louvain and seems to have been quite taken with Netherlandish educational ways. More does not seem to have been very much impressed with the University of Paris, however. Later on, when the question of the education of his own children and those of friends was under discussion, he said that he knew no reason why they should be sent to Paris rather than to Oxford or to Cambridge.

Shortly before More's sojourn in the French capital, some time between 1505 and 1510, Erasmus of Rotterdam was at the University of Paris. We have no definite opinion of his with regard to the teaching value of educational methods at the University of Paris, though their neglect of Latin does not seem to have spoiled his own classic Latinity. For a number of years there were friends of Erasmus at the University of Paris, from whom he received letters containing accounts of events there. Most of his friends seem not to have been overmuch impressed with the value of Paris University training.

The reputation enjoyed by the University of Paris in the outer world may be gathered from two noteworthy incidents at the beginning of the sixteenth century. When Luther's doctrines first began to be a source of discussion, and consequently of religious discord in Germany, Frederick, the Elector of Saxony, applied to the faculty of the University of Paris for a decision with regard to their tenability. A little later, when Henry VIII., with Anne Boleyn already in view, wished to obtain a divorce from Catherine of Aragon, he also applied to the University of Paris for a decision with regard to the theological and ethical points at issue. These appeals for judgment give a better idea of the universal appreciation of the position of the University of Paris than any discussion of its actual value as an educational centre.

Most of the repute enjoyed by the University of Paris and the ele-

ment in its teaching that probably led Frederick and Henry VIII. more than anything else to make their applications was undoubtedly the well-known subtlety of its dialecticians. Surely, if ever, the days of the old sophists had returned here in Paris, and her logicians would have deserved very well the satirical pen of another Aristophanes for their unfailing efforts to make the worse appear the better part. This had become so remarkable that in 1530 the faculty of arts of the University of Paris confessed with sadness: "*L'Universite etait devenue la risée des nations etrangeres pas les subtilites de sa dialectu tiqueo.*" "The University of Paris has become the laughing stock of foreign nations because of the subtility of its dialectics."[3]

Very little improvement came in the teaching of the classics at the University of Paris until competition became a factor in arousing the dormant energies of university professors. About 1560 the Jesuits were allowed, by Papal rescript, to open the College de Clermont. After this the classics were better taught, for the Jesuits made them a special feature of their curriculum, and very soon raised the standard of the teaching of Latin all over Europe.

Jourdain, who takes up the history of the University of Paris in the sixteenth century where the old University Chronicler Boulay leaves off, apologizes for the condition of the University at the beginning of the sixteenth century and blames it on the unsettled state of the times. He says:

"Any one who knows the history of France well will surely recognize that there never was an age more disturbed by ideas and expectations of revolution and by warring diversity of opinion than the sixteenth century. Civil war lent all its acerbity to make these conditions more and more unbearable and to disturb the usual order of things."[4]

Notwithstanding all that has been said about the low standard of education at the University of Paris, the picture of University life at the beginning of the sixteenth century is not without its brighter side. For instance, Aleander's work in introducing Greek into the University must ever remain as a noble landmark in Western educational development. At the beginning of his career Aleander seems to have been very little appreciated. After an absence of several years, however, at a rival university he was recalled to become one of the bright lights of the University of Paris.

The neglect of the classics at the University of Paris was not with-

[3] "Die Universitaet Paris und die Fremden an Derselben in Mittelalter." Von Dr. Alexander Budinszky, Professor an der Universitaet Czernowitz. [4] Cuilibet Gallicæ Gentis annales investiganti nullam unquam aetas occurrit quae novarum rerum studio et expectatione variis opinionum adversarum concertationibus diuturna belli plus quam civilis atrocitate. Magis elata fuerit magisque exagitata et afflicta quam seculum sextum decimum. "Index Chronologicus Chartarum Pertinetium ad Historiam Universitatis Parisiensis. Studio et cura Caroli Jourdain." Supplement to the History of the University of Paris by Jourdain.

out its compensations in other ways. To the emptiness of educational ideals we doubtless owe the fact that Francis Xavier, the brilliant young professor at the College Dormans-Beauvais for several years during the third decade of the century, was ready to give up his professorship and follow Ignatius of Loyola, whose acquaintanceship he had made at the university on the quixotic mission to the Holy Land. Their mission proved not to be *in partibus infidelium*, but in the very heart of the Church itself. The foundation of the great teaching order that was to reform education and, incidentally, revolutionize the methods of classical teaching at the University ofParis was to result from this unnoticed movement among a few Spanish students.

Ignatius himself spent the six years between 1528 and 1534 at the College Sant Barbe. In the latter year he received there the degree of Master of Arts. Laynez and Salmeron, Lefevre and Rodriguez, the other original members of the Society of Jesus, were, like Francis Xavier, acquaintances made by Ignatius during his course at the University.

There were always a good many Spaniards in attendance at the University of Paris, and the autumn after Ignatius and his companions left on their pilgrimage Michael Servetus, who came, as did Ignatius himself and Francis Xavier, from the Spanish provinces near the Pyrenees, took up the study of medicine at the University. Servetus came from Villanueva in Aragon, and he is sometimes known as Michael Villanueva. He was only 25 when he came, but he had already signalized himself by a tendency to independent thinking. After only two years of the study of medicine he set up as a lecturer on the subject himself.

One of the beneficial results of the exaggerated tendency to fritter away time on what the faculty of the University rather leniently and euphemistically called "the subtleties of dialectics" was that more attention than was usual at Universities of that period was devoted by serious students to the practical professions of law and medicine and to original investigation in the nascent physical sciences.

Servetus' favorite teacher at the University of Paris was Vesalius. Vesalius was a young man, but he had already accomplished some of that work in anatomy which deservedly gained for him the title of "Father of Anatomy." Vesalius had been attracted to Paris by the reputation of Sylvius, whose name and fame are bound up with the subject of brain anatomy. One of the most important fissures in the brain, near which lie the great motor centres, is called the Sylvian fissure because of its discovery and description by this distinguished University of Paris professor. Vesalius was especially noted for his dissections while at the University of Paris, and most of the material

for his famous work, "De Humani Corporis Fabrica," was obtained during his work at the University.

These early years of the sixteenth century practically saw the beginning of the modern inductive sciences. The observations from which the great principles of the succeeding centuries were to be drawn were being made in many places throughout Europe. When Vesalius left the University of Paris it was to continue his studies in anatomy in Italy, especially at Bologna and Padua. In Italy he was brought intimately into association with men like Eustachius and Fallopius, whose names are forever attached to structures in the human body which they were the first to describe.

The plates for Vesalius' great work are probably the best anatomical illustrations that have ever been prepared. There has always been a discussion as to the artist who assisted Vesalius in his work. A reasonably well founded tradition exists to the effect that their designer was no less a personage than Titian, the Venetian artist. Titian is known to have been a friend of Vesalius, and the plates are worthy even of his reputation. His artistic interest in anatomy would have been sufficient to encourage him to undertake the work. Its accomplishment would really have been a labor of love, a precious bit of training for his artistic development. It was but shortly before this time that that other of the greatest artists, Leonardo da Vinci, numbered among manifold attainments a wonderfully exact knowledge of human anatomy and insisted that the artist must possess this knowledge to be successful.

Everywhere were the signs of the awakening of that spirit of investigation of nature and enthusiasm for independent observation which was to prove the origin of modern science. Bacon, who lived at the end of this century and the beginning of the next, is often spoken of as the father of the inductive sciences. By a curious misconception in history it not infrequently happens that the collator of the work of others becomes, to posterity, the originator of ideas of which he was only an especially impressionable recipient. Bacon himself was not a scientist in any true sense of the word, and his work consisted only of the expression and arrangement of the principles of observation that had been, long before his time, applied by men who were real scientific discoverers.

Into what unexpected dangers the pursuit of science might bring a devotee may be gathered from Vesalius' career. He gave up his position of anatomist at the University of Paris in order to become the private physician of Philip II. of Spain. He gave excellent satisfaction and continued his anatomical work whenever the opportunity offered. One of his patients, a prominent nobleman, died of some disease that Vesalius could not explain. He asked and ob-

tained permission from the family to make an examination of his internal organs in order to find out the cause of death. He allowed some friends of the deceased to be present while he was making the autopsy. They either saw, or thought they saw, life in the dead body after Vesalius made his incision for examination purposes. How easy it would be for the lively imagination of friends to persuade them that motion occurred where there really was none? It may have been that Vesalius mistook one of the cases of cataleptic trance which sometimes simulate death so completely as to make their recognition extremely difficult.

However that may be, for his unintentional homicide he was condemned to death. The sentence was commuted by Philip II. to a pilgrimage to the Holy Sepulchre. This Vesalius made successfully, but on his return he was shipwrecked on the Island of Zante and died as a consequence of the exposure and over fatigue. His death took place October 15, 1564, when he was only 50 years of age and when there was still promise of great advances in anatomy at his hands.

It was during this transitional period that the future martyr for heresies on the Trinity came to Paris. Under the inspiration of Vesalius' example, and very probably with his personal guidance and assistance, Servetus devoted himself to human anatomy with great enthusiasm. Besides Vesalius, Servetus came under the influence of Sylvius, whose work had made him famous throughout Europe and whose success would prompt the ambitious young Spaniard to hard work. At the end of two years Servetus received his license to practice, after having demonstrated before the faculty his ability to defend a set of theses from Galen's works. He would be said in modern terms to have carried off the honors of his class. *Vix ulli secundus cognitione Galeni*—scarcely second to any in his knowledge of Galen—was the verdict of the faculty of the University after they had listened to his brilliant disputation.

As we have already said, the training in medicine given by the University consisted in these disputations. The study of patients was very little encouraged. It was much more important in the eyes of the medical faculty to know the various passages in Galen's works that referred to a special type of disease than to have seriously investigated the individual symptoms that a series of patients might present. With this verdict of the faculty, then, as the stamp of his knowledge of medicine Servetus was ready to set up as a lecturer at the University immediately after his graduation.

There was a large number of students at the University at this time, some ten thousand altogether, and as the courses taken were

not arranged in the methodical fashion usual at universities now, it was not hard for a young lecturer to get a set of pupils. Servetus was especially favored by the fact that he came from the Pyrenees region in Spain, for there were, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, a large number of Spanish students from this region in Paris. Of this the best evidence is that such men as Ignatius of Loyola and Francis Xavier, and Laynez and Salmaron had gone out of their own country in order to complete their education at Paris. There seems to have been not a little national solidarity. Servetus proved to be a very popular lecturer, and, as events shortly showed, made many friends among those in attendance at the University.

His special application to the study of Galen during his undergraduate years does not seem to have given him that exclusive reverence for that master's work which was usually imbibed by the students of the period. His tendency to think for himself very soon manifested itself. During the course of his professorship at Paris he published a book on the use of syrups in medicine, in which he completely broke away from Galenic traditions with regard to the treatment of disease.

It is characteristic of the temper of the times that the publication of this book almost led to serious disturbance in the University. Members of the faculty took different sides as to the advisability of allowing the book to appear under the ægis of the University or permitting its author to teach any longer within the precincts of Paris, or with the sanction of the University authorities. To break with established tradition in any line of knowledge was a serious matter. Any departure from the teachings of the ancients was a sort of heresy. Heresy meant choice of doctrine, and there was to be no picking nor choosing of the dogmas that were to be taught in the University in any department. Everything was to be regulated by authority, and the authority in medicine was Galen, whose *ipse dixit* must be regarded as infallible and must be maintained at all cost.

It is a pregnant sign of the times that there were enough of the reactionary party in the faculty of the University and among the students to support Servetus in his risky declaration of independence of thought. For a long time, however, the situation at the University was very tense. Many a hard word was bandied, and there was even rioting on the street and some serious injuries were inflicted. Servetus refused to withdraw his book, and finally was allowed to maintain his position. Peace, however, was not fully restored until after a decree of Parliament had made it a penal offense to discuss in public, either *pro* or *con*, certain of the mooted points that had been brought up by the controversy.

Those were days when people took themselves and their ideas very

seriously. When individuals held opinions they seemed always ready to fight for them, no matter how trivial the subject matter of the opinions might be. Controversies over disputed points in which ordinarily sane men of later times can see nothing of importance might easily lead, and did often actually lead, to bloodshed. Parliaments and municipal councils in most of the cities of Europe had for this reason often to interfere by formal decrees in what seemed purely academic discussions of the most impractical and impersonal character.

Controversy of all kinds took on an acerbity that we can scarcely comprehend in the midst of our lackadaisical indifferentism. Culture has at least brought this benefit in its train that we have learned to conceal our impatience in public with those who disagree with us. During the sixteenth century mere wordy discussions, in which opponents were really disputing over nothing more serious than a differing assumption of significance in terms, were prone to become extremely bitter. Towards the end of the century zealous churchmen, representative members of great educational institutions, could scarcely disagree over a minor point in theology without accusing one another of unnatural crimes and impugning one another's ancestry.

As the result of his first book and certain letters in which he criticized Calvinistic doctrine, a lively epistolary discussion ensued between Calvin and Servetus, in which some extremely bitter things were said on both sides. The general impression outside of Switzerland, or rather outside the pale of Calvin's influence, seemed to have been that Calvin got the worst of it in the dispute. For this he never forgave Servetus. It was evidently personal rancor, rather than religious zeal, that prompted the Genevan reformer to take advantage of his power and put Servetus to death, when, by an unfortunate combination of circumstances, his young opponent fell into his hands.

The odium theologicum, so characteristic of the time, can be gathered very well from some of the courtesies that passed between these two representatives of sacred truth, as they considered themselves, during the course of their discussion. "Calvin was so incensed against Servetus" (as the result of this epistolary discussion) "that he could not forbear to revile him in his commentaries upon the Bible. He calls him a 'profligate fellow' *(un mescant garnement)*, 'full of pride and a dog.' This is in the edition of the year 1553, in the commentary upon the first verse of the first chapter of St. John's gospel. Calvin wrote those words before Servetus came to Geneva, for the epistle dedicatory (of this edition) is dated January first, 1553. In 1546 Calvin had written to Farel a letter in which he says: 'I

am informed that Servetus is coming hither (to Geneva), on purpose to have some conversation with me. If I have any influence on the magistrates of Geneva, I will take effectual care that he never goes from hence alive.' "[5]

The next century was not very old before two learned and presumably phlegmatic Dutchmen became embroiled in a discussion over a Greek enclitic particle. Before the controversy was ended, we may say, by the way, that it was never decided, these two most distinguished classical scholars in Europe provided an exhibition of give and take in Latin Billingsgate that has amused students of the classics ever since and been a precious mine for terms of contempt and slang abuse couched in classical latinity.

Those were dangerous times in which to indulge in the luxury of original ideas. We may still be of the profound conviction that people who disagree with us in important ethical principles are insincere. But we do not consider that they deserve to be hanged, drawn and quartered, or to be burned until dead for their opinions. In the sixteenth century, however, the spirit of intolerance ran very high. Men were only beginning to realize that they need not necessarily follow the lines of thought laid out for them by Plato and Aristotle and Hippocrates and Galen. The consciousness that they could think straight for themselves without consulting authority on every subject apparently aroused in men's minds the conviction that when others took the same liberty and came to conclusions different from theirs, then those who disagreed with them must be wrong and deserved to be punished.

Of Servetus' treatise on syrups, over which there was so much disturbance, it may be said that it represents a distinct advance in the prescribing of drugs. To the casual medical reader of the present day it is an insoluble problem why there should have been so bitter a controversy over the book. It is, of course, a marked departure from Galen and Galenic methods of treatment. This departure is, however, distinctly in the line of advance. There are many falsities, of course, but some of Servetus' ideas were to be adopted by the medical profession generally before very long. This book contains the first suggestion of the proper employment of vehicles in prescriptions, that is, of solutions tasty and pleasant smelling which, while of no special service in themselves, are useful because they enable other drugs to be held in solution. The book contains some of the first steps in progress away from the nauseous mixtures that were so

[5] These quotations are from "An Impartial History of Michael Servetus, Burned Alive at Geneva for Heresy." Anonymous. London, Printed for Aaron Ward at the King's Arms in Little Britain, 1724. The book is rare, but there is a copy of it in the Library of the Academy of Medicine of New York City and another in the library of the Catholic Summer School, the latter a donation from the New York Academy of Medicine.

popular during mediæval times. The principles on which Servetus suggests the making of syrups would eliminate the tendency to precipitation of drugs, so common in the old mixtures, and laid the first principle by which the mingling of incompatible ingredients could be avoided.

It is surprising to think that this work could have been accomplished by a man whose main purpose was not practical, but eminently theoretic. It must have required a number of experiments and a considerable amount of careful observation to secure the data necessary for the detailed information the book contains. The faculty of observation was, in fact, the strong side of Servetus' mind. When he wandered into the realm of theory and metaphysics he fell into egregious errors difficult to understand. Unfortunately, however, as is so often the case, instead of cultivating his most promising faculties, he looked for his fame from the employment of powers that had not been granted him.

All through his books we find the marks of his acute and accurate powers of observation. We shall have occasion to remark on the great discovery of the minor circulation which he made as the result of his dissecting work. He ignored the value of these precise observations so much that it is only when his knowledge of supposedly unknown facts is introduced casually and for the purpose of illustrating phases of his metaphysical speculations that we know anything of his having made them.

Deeply interested as Servetus must have been in his scientific medical work, in various departments, it is not a little difficult to explain why he should have left Paris to take up the position of an ordinary practitioner of medicine in the provinces. It may well have been that financial reasons weighed most in influencing his decision. Lecturers at the University of Paris were but illy paid, and while money was not nearly as important a consideration in those days as in ours, this reason might well have its weight with a young man who found himself rather unpopular with one faction of the University faculty and so could not look for rapid promotion.

It has been suggested that there may have been a woman in the case. At the time when Servetus was teaching at the University of Paris, and for most of the century that followed, the old mediæval monastic tradition with regard to bachelor professors still continued in vogue. No one of the teaching staff of the University was allowed to be married. This was true not only for the members of the faculties of arts and letters and theology, departments which more properly belonged to monastic teachers, but was insisted upon also for the members of the faculties of the schools of medicine and law. It was not until 1600 that the professors of medicine, who were

usually at the same time, as they are at present, practicing physicians in the city of Paris, were allowed to take to themselves wives, without resigning their University professorship. This regulation of enforced bachelorhood remained in effect for even the lay professors in the other faculties until nearly the middle of the seventeenth century.

It is almost needless to say that these regulations, which concerned also the students of the University, none of whom were allowed to be married, did not conduce to the morality of the University quarter of the town. Many of the traditions of the notorious Quartier Latin come down from the days when these University regulations were in force. They account for some of the queer University decrees in which there is evidence of what to us seems a totally unwarranted compounding with vice.

Whether the proverbial woman in the case had anything to do with Servetus' removal from Paris is extremely doubtful. We have no record of his marriage. Some years later there are obscure references to a proposal of marriage on his part, but the data are so incomplete as to leave the issue of the marital negotiations in doubt. The trouble over his book may well have provided pretext enough to leave Paris gladly.

When the Bishop of Vienne and Dauphiny offered him the post of private physician, Servetus accepted it. His idea very probably was to obtain time for what would in our day be called literary labor. In his active brain, unshackled by traditions, many thoughts were seeking expression. At that time no one amounted to anything in the educational world unless he had written something on theological subjects. The air was full of controversy. Every one who presumed that he could think straight on any subject felt impelled to dabble in theological discussion. Servetus' first work had been published several years before his connection, either as student or professor, with the University of Paris. It had attracted considerable attention because of its hardihood and the fact that its author was scarcely beyond his majority. The subject taken was the loftiest in theology, and the method of treating it was the form least calculated to make friends for its author. Its title was "De Trinitatis Erroribus." Something of the avidity with which such books were read may be gathered from the fact that the second edition of the book was called for within a year after its first publication. This second edition was revised and enlarged and received the title "Dialogorum de Trinitate, Libri Duo."

It might have been hoped that Servetus' devotion in the meantime to serious anatomical and medical studies would have taken him out of the dangerous field of theological discussion. As a

matter of fact, it seems to have had this effect for a number of years. For some years Servetus devoted his spare time to editing scientific books of various kinds for a publisher in Lyons not far from Vienne. Among other books which he edited was the geography of Ptolemy. This seems to have been a popular book, for a second edition was called for within a year or two. Servetus' notes on the geography of Ptolemy are eminently characteristic of the man. He rises above the limited circle of ideas of the old geographer to see the wide relations that geography may have with all the sciences. While Ptolemy's descriptions and maps were concerned only with political, and to a certain extent with physical, geography, Servetus conceived the idea that the science of the description of the earth should be made to include scientific data of various kinds, botanical, zoölogical, astronomical, according to the varying physical phenomena to be found in different parts of the known world. As a consequence of this broad view of the application of geography, Servetus has been called by a number of good authorities the Father of Comparative Geography.

In the meantime Servetus seems to have been careful not to neglect his medicine. There is an account of his having taken several courses at the University of Montpelier, whose medical faculty has been distinguished almost as far back as the history of universities in Europe extends. These intervals of attendance at the University of Montpelier may very well have occurred during the absence of the Archbishop of Vienne, either on a journey to Paris or to Rome, for Servetus continued to hold his post of body physician to that prelate. In 1545 the Council of Trent began its session and the absence of the Archbishop at some of the sessions of the Council may have given Servetus opportunities for scientific work at the University of Montpelier, which was somewhat easier to reach and had none of the forbidding associations of Paris.

About the middle of the decade, 1540 to 1550, Servetus was tempted once more to enter the field of theological discussion. He denied some of the doctrines of Calvin, and this led to a discussion with the Geneva reformer in which the usual absence of amenity on both sides is the distinguishing characteristic. That this discussion did not cause him to neglect his practice as a physician is evident from the fact that when, a few years later, the authorities of Vienne wished to arrest and imprison him because of his book, which was deemed to be heretical, they found it very easy to secure his imprisonment by summoning him as if to see a sick prisoner, and then retaining him under duress.

It was not until 1553 that Servetus published the book which caused his death. There is only one complete copy of the first edi-

tion of that book in existence. It is one of the world's bibliophilic treasures, and is in the Bibliotheque Nationale at Paris. There is an imperfect copy, the only other example of the first edition that is known to be in existence, in the Imperial Library of Austria at Vienna. The Paris copy was purchased by the Bibliotheque Nationale through an English agent in Louis XIV.'s time. The price then paid for it was 13,000 francs, about $2,600. Its value at the present time, of course, can scarcely be computed.

Besides being the only perfect copy of a first edition the book is interesting for other reasons. It belonged for a number of years to the library of Dr. Richard Mead, the most famous English physician of his time. Dr. Mead, himself a prolific writer in medicine, and Chief Physician to the English Court, was a great friend of the literary men of his time, and included among his intimates such men as Pope, Johnson, Hogarth and others. Mead was very much interested in Servetus, and began the publication of an edition of this book which was to be in every way a replica of the original edition. He did not live to complete his work, though there were some copies of an edition of Servetus, imitating the original in every way, issued shortly afterward in Holland.

There is a tradition that the volume owned by the Bibliotheque Nationale in Paris is the original copy that was used by the public prosecutor at Geneva for the abstraction of the passages that were used at Servetus' trial to demonstrate the heresies contained in the book. There are certain brownish patches here and there on the edges of the leaves that look as though they would crumble at the touch and certain parts that have actually crumbled. These are pointed out as marks of the fire in which the unfortunate author of the book perished. For there is a tradition that this copy was deposited on the funeral pyre to be burned with Servetus in accordance with the decree of the Court at Geneva. It is supposed to have been rescued by some one whose zeal was not exactly according to Calvin and to have been sent to England to avoid the danger that might well come from its possession in either France or Switzerland at the time.

The book is not in the original binding, and so the question of its having been singed by fire is hard to decide. There seems no good reason to think that the Geneva copy escaped the holocaust prepared for it. Unfortunately for the picturesque tradition, recent investigation seems to show that the crumbly patches are only the result of mildew.

The visitor to the Museum of the Bibliotheque Nationale will still be told, however, that this is the public prosecutor's copy saved from the flames. I have even heard one of the best known members of

the medical faculty of the University of Paris, Professor Charles Richet, the distinguished physiologist, state in a public lecture his belief in the old tradition with regard to this being the public prosecutor's copy.

The book was published without either author or publisher's name on the title page. Servetus realized the danger which his notions on the Trinity made him incur. The title of the book is a curiosity in itself. It runs:

CHRISTIANI-
SMI Restitu-
TIO.

arranged exactly in the way we have placed it here. The whole of the title is "CHRISTIANISMI RESTITUTIO, Totius Ecclesiae Apostolicae est ad sua Limina Vocatio, in Integrum Restituta Cognitione Dei, Fidei Christi Justificationis Nostrae Regenerationis Baptisme et Caenae Domini Manducationis. Restuto Denique Nobis Regno Ceolesti, Babylonis Captivatate Soluta et Anti-Christo Cum Suis Penitus Destructo."

They were not sparing of words in their titles in those days, and the peculiar division of the first and principal words of the title, which are in large capitals, show how near we are to the incunabala of printing.

The anonymity of the book as regards author and publisher did not save Servetus, however. The book was condemned by the ecclesiastical authorities and search made for the writer. When it was discovered that Servetus was the author it was resolved to throw him into prison in order to await the action of the civil authorities. There seems to have been some hesitancy as to the legal status of this decision, or else there was fear that if Servetus were served publicly with a warrant his friends might find some way to warn him before being brought to prison. Perhaps the ecclesiastical authorities had no formal agents to carry out their decrees. As a consequence Servetus was inveigled to prison by the scheme which has been mentioned. Utterly unsuspicious, he answered the call of professional duty that brought him presumably to see a sick prisoner and then was detained in prison.

The most remarkable feature of Servetus' life is the number of friends he made and the readiness they displayed in supporting him in difficult and dangerous circumstances. At the University of Paris during his trouble with the University authorities this is especially manifest. That he had succeeded in making many friends in Vienne also we have hinted already in a suggested explanation of the stratagem employed to get him to prison. These friends were not numerous and powerful enough to assure his acquittal, but they suc-

ceeded in enabling Servetus to escape from prison. Servetus at once made his way out of France with the purpose of eventually reaching Naples, where he had some Spanish friends, on whose protection he could rely. On the way to Naples, unfortunately for him, he delayed for a day or two at Geneva.

Perhaps he was tempted to see for himself some of the political conditions that surrounded Calvin and that he hoped to do this incognito. The most important characteristic of the quasi-republican government at Geneva under Calvin's influence was the fact that nearly every second person was a spy, ready to furnish information spontaneously, or for a proper reward, to the authorities. The Protestant reformer, who believed that a certain number of the human race were predestined to damnation and could not by any effort of their own secure their salvation, acted up to his belief in practical life. He utterly distrusted those around him, and by a system of extensive espionage hoped to secure the subservience of the people and their fidelity to his religious tenets.

Servetus was recognized, arrested and thrown into prison. He lay in prison for some time until the Council of Geneva had been properly prepared to give him the benefit of the sternest justice. This seems to have required no little persuasion on Calvin's part. The trial lasted for nearly two months. The reformer's bitter hatred, however, of the man who had made him ridiculous in controversy finally succeeded in winning the Judges over to his own cruel decision. Servetus was condemned to death, his death to be on the funeral pyre.

On October the 14th, 1553, the sacrifice was consummated. There is a tradition that the wood used for the pyre was green and did not burn well. When the match was first put to it, it flared up and for the moment it seemed to be all over with the young reformer whose life was ending thus unhappily at the age of 42. In the first moment of pain Servetus cried out in Spanish, in a voice evidently directed to heaven: "Misericordias! Misericordias!" "Mercy! Mercy!" Then, as the slow burning wood failed to put him out of agony at once, he was heard to pray: "Jesus, Son of the Eternal God, have mercy on me." In order to hasten his death, the executioner seems to have been directed to rearrange the burning wood. This is supposed to have given the opportunity for the rescue of the book, which was condemned to be burned with its author.

It would be absurd to blame Calvin alone for the death of Servetus. The execution was really the outcome of the intolerance of the Protestantism of the time. Many of the reformers of that day supported the action of Calvin and wrote him letters commending the course pursued by the Council of Geneva. Zwinglius was outspoken in his

commendation of Calvin's action. Martin Butzer, of Strasbourg, and Oikolampadius, of Basle, publicly expressed their justification of Servetus' execution. Even the gentle Melancthon, mildest of the reformers, sent letters of congratulation to Calvin on the pious deed he had done that would form "a memorable example for posterity." Alexander Hales said "that the citizens of Geneva had deserved well of all the churches by overcoming the new Mahomet, whose invasion of Christianity was even more dangerous than the Eastern Prophet's had been."[6]

As the result of the death of Servetus a reaction set in among all classes with regard to execution for written or spoken heresy. The spirit of this reaction is best expressed by some famous sentences of Castalion, a Professor at the University of Basle at the time. Castalion in a public letter addressed to the authorities at Geneva said:

"To kill a man is not to defend any doctrine; it is only to kill a man. The magistrates of a city are bound in duty to protect the life and property of its citizens. As to the defense of truth, that is not the business either of the magistrate or of the executioner. It concerns the teacher and the pastor. When a heretic attacks religion only by words and arguments, religion must be defended only by arguments and words, that is to say, by purely spiritual arms."[7]

In general the effect of Servetus' death was to produce a new point of view with regard to freedom of speech and writing. Under the circumstances one cannot help but recall the famous self-sacrifice of the monk, Telemachus, in order to stop the gladiatorial shows that continued to be held even under the Christian Emperors. Servetus, of course, did not anticipate any such happy consequence of his sad fate, and yet his execution foreordained quite as effectually as the sad fate of Telemachus put an end to the human sacrifices of the arena the abolition of the death penalty for heresy. The ardent young scientist might have met a kindlier fate for his foolish overzeal, but scarcely one that would have satisfied him more could he have foreseen its eventual results for science and thought.

Servetus was one of those unfortunate men, enviable geniuses to posterity, but uncomfortable human beings in their relations to their

---

[6] These quotations are from the article "Charakterbild Michel Servetis, von Henri Tollin," contained in Virchow's "Sammlung Wissenschaftlicher Vortraege," Eleventh Series, No. 254. [7] This seems to be the first formal expression ever made of the right of liberty of speech and writing in matters of religion. It thus reflects the first ray of the dawn of the era to which we have grown accustomed. For this reason the passage in its succinct entirety seems worth quoting in the original. "Tuer un homme ce n'est pas defendré une doctrine ce n'est que tuer un homme. Le magistrat doit defendré la vie et les biens des citoyens, quant a defendré la verité c'est l'affaire non du magistrat ni du bourreau, mais du docteur, et du pasteur. Quand un heretique n'attaque la religion que par des paroles et des arguments il ne faut la defendré que par des arguments en des paroles c'est á dire par des armes jurement spirituelles." Quoted from Article "Servetistes" in the Dictionnaire La Rousse.

fellow-men. His career occurred when "the times were out of joint," and he thought that he was born "to set them right." Had he come in the nineteenth century he would surely have been recognized as an independent thinker, would have been hailed probably as the founder of a new school of philosophic thought, would have tried to reconcile science and religion with sufficient leaning towards science to make him mildly suspect of heresy, and would have "lived happy ever after." In the sixteenth century he was eminently out of place, and his unfortunate end was the result.

One of the most surprising things in his book on the Trinity is to find the first description of the pulmonary circulation that was ever penned, brought in as a figure that he thought would serve to make clear some of the ideas evolved in this conception of the Trinity and the relations of the Divine Persons to one another. When Servetus came to talk of the Holy Spirit animating the other persons of the Trinity, he compares it to the air animating the flesh through the blood in this human trinity that constitutes man.

The vital spirit, he says, "is generated by the mixture in the lungs of the inspired air with the subtly elaborated blood, which the right ventricle sends to the left. The communication between the ventricles, however, is not made through the midwall of the heart, but in a wonderful way the fluid blood is conducted by a long detour from the right ventricle through the lungs, where it is acted on by the lungs and becomes red in color, passes from the arteriac venosa into the vena arteriosa, whence it is finally drawn by the diastole into the left ventricle."

A better description of the lesser or pulmonic circulation could not be written in our own day, and yet this was printed 150 years before Harvey "discovered" the circulation of the blood. This does not detract from the value of Harvey's wonderful synthetic work, but it serves to show that, like all great discoveries, the realization of the circulation of the blood was not the sudden inspiration of an individual intellect, but a gradual evolution of human opinion, finding its first clear and culminating expression in the mind of a genius. After that expression has come, it behooves posterity not to forget the names, or the labors, of the men who paved the way for genius and made possible the great step of advance.

When one reads the involved, cloudy style of Servetus in other parts of his book on the Trinity, and is hampered by the obscurity in which Servetus' ideas are constantly wrapt up, and then stumbles suddenly on this passage of pure physical science, expressed so succinctly and completely, one is almost tempted to believe that the passage is a surreptitious later addition made by another hand. The description of the pulmonary circulation, however, is to be found

in the original edition preserved in the Bibliotheque Nationale at Paris, with its perhaps fire-charred edges and the name of the Prosecutor Colladon going down to an infamous immortality on its fly leaf.

Poor Servetus is a characteristic representative of a tendency that has always existed in scientific men, especially in those whose investigations carry them beyond the bounds of knowledge as fixed up to their time. Another striking example of this tendency was manifest in Galileo about fifty years later, at the beginning of the seventeenth century. To these men there came, unfortunately, the seductive idea that the methods that have served to widen human science and light up its obscurities will surely accomplish a similar purpose in theological science. A corollary of this belief is the feeling that their own scientific attainments will help to illustrate theology and illumine its obscurities. Scientific men down to our own time have felt sure that their successful investigations demanded a serious modification of theological tenets. They have been surprised if a reformation has not been at once undertaken in existing beliefs and an alteration of accepted dogmata. When conservative churchmen have, unaccountably as it seemed to their scientific minds, hesitated to begin the reform, they have been ready and eager to point the way.

The old dogmata remain unshaken despite the scientific advances of three centuries and a half since Servetus' death. Scientific men, in constant succession since his time, have each in turn, with certain noteworthy exceptions, felt the impulsion to invade the domain of theology. All of them who have done so have aroused enmity; none of them have done any direct good. The precious lesson *suum cuique* has not been learned. The acerbity of feeling that characterized the resistance to earlier unwarranted invasions on the part of as yet inchoate science has died out. There remain, as the heritage of the past, a precious warning for later times, the inevitable errors of the scientist *supra crepidam* impatient for religious reform. Some of the theological errors of the latter day scientist are quite as inexplicable as the obscure wanderings of Servetus with regard to the Trinity. The experience of the past will not, however, prevent others from taking up theological discussion to their discomfiture, and so the world goes on learning from the past, but so slowly and with so many a swing of the pendulum of opinion in reverse direction that intellectual progress seems almost negative to an impatient generation hoping for so much for humanity and attaining so little in the span of one human life.

JAMES J. WALSH.

New York, N. Y.

THE SUPERNATURAL.

STUDENTS of ecclesiastical history have said that nearly all the heresies in the Church took their rise in some confusion of notions with regard to what is called the natural and the supernatural order of things. If this be so, we need not be surprised to find that this want of clearness of apprehension should lead to errors of the most opposite kinds. And so we do. Certainly the narrow rigor of Jansenism seems to be the very antipodes of that tendency to broad liberality which is the apprehended religious danger of the present day. And yet this confusion is at the root of both these schools of error. In the letter of our Holy Father condemning this liberalism, or disposition to liberalism, he says: "It is hard to understand how those who are imbued with Christian principles can place the natural above the supernatural virtues, and attribute to them greater power and fecundity." Therefore, according to the Holy Father, there are some men at the present time whose ideas are so obscure on this subject that they appear actually to place the natural virtues higher in their estimation than those of the supernatural order. Now what about the Jansenists? Thus Jansenius expresses himself in the introduction to his famous work: "God had to create the first man perfect like the angels, not only innocent, but positively pure, good and holy or happy. This is original grace, which consequently is *natural* to man; it is given to him essentially by and with creation, not as an additional gift." A more radical error could not have been invented; the whole Christian idea of grace is destroyed by making it something due to nature.

Nothing is more clear than the doctrine of the Catholic Church on grace. Nevertheless it is not generally very much explained or developed to our children or the people. The more exterior dogmata of religion are dwelt upon at length. This part of our belief which is innermost in our faith, the soul, so to say, of our doctrine, is, to a great extent, passed over or at least is not exposed very minutely. The writer of this article at one time wished to give a course of instructions on the seven capital sins or vices. He came to envy. Now envy is as existent in the human heart as grass on the fields. He looked over a number of books to find a sermon on envy. He could not find one. Sermons on all kinds of subjects, practical, actual or otherwise. But a sermon on envy, not one to be got. Perhaps, then, at the risk of appearing to write a catechetical dissertation rather than an essay proper to a review or magazine, I may be permitted to give a brief and simple explanation of the teach-

ing of our holy mother the Church on this question of the supernatural as interpreted by the most approved authorities.

According to Christian revelation, as taught by the Catholic Church, grace is *not* due to nature at all. God might have created man and the angels, too, in what is called a state of pure nature. We are told that He made both man and the angels in a sanctified state, giving to the latter a degree of grace corresponding to, or suited to, their individual perfection. Thus if one angel were many times more perfect naturally than another angel, God gave to him so many times more grace. To this one grace the angels corresponded or they did not. Those who did obtained immediately their reward. So that the angels preserve their hierarchical order in heaven, according to the common opinion, the same as if they had been created and remained in a purely natural condition. It is a pious belief that the souls of men are sanctified in various degrees so as to fill the gaps left in this blessed hierarchy by the defection of the fallen spirits. To the first man God gave a certain measure of sanctifying or habitual grace as he saw fit. God might have created him with or without grace, as he is now, in what we call his fallen state, subject, that is, to suffering, with evil inclinations, etc. He did not; He created him exempt from all these things, with the additional possession of grace. Now this grace is always accompanied by, if it is not one with, the theological virtue of charity. For grace is a real something, something existing in the soul, created there by God, not due to nature, of an incomprehensibly higher order than the order of nature, entirely different in kind, something which makes man resemble his Maker as He is personally constituted, as by nature he resembles Him in substance or being.

Without grace man would never have suspected or known the existence of the Trinity; he would not have been called to the beatific vision; God would have been his last end, and after his present life, if his soul were pleasing to God, he would enjoy a happiness great indeed, but incomparably below that to which he is now called. He would see God as from outside, as we look at a picture, or as we look at the outside of a palace; whereas, if he dies in the possession of grace, he will be received into the bosom of the blessed Trinity; he will be like the child of the house, who has the whole run of it and from whom nothing is concealed. If Adam had been created without grace, he naturally would have died and then entered into the possession of his natural happiness, if he deserved it. But being once called to a life of grace, he had no longer the choice to be contented with a state of natural perfection or to aim at that which was higher. He was obliged to correspond with grace, and to die, if he died, in a state of grace. For the grace of God was of two kinds,

actual and habitual. Habitual grace was a permanent thing which was infused into Adam's soul at the moment of his creation, and which is now received by infants with their baptism. Actual grace is the help or assistance God gives to the soul in order to enable it to perform actions of the supernatural kind. To man God did not give so much habitual grace and no more. On the contrary, so long as man lives he can increase the sum of his habitual grace, and this he does by corresponding with the actual graces he receives. Every time that man coöperates with the impulse of the Holy Ghost, accomplishes an act of obedience and love for God, the Almighty at the same time increases in a proper proportion the amount of grace in his soul. This is similar to what takes place in the natural order. Habits are strengthened by acts. It is by repeated acts that we become confirmed in our habits both of virtue and of vice. The supernatural virtues grow in the same way, only in this case God must Himself cause the augmentation directly by His creative power in the supernatural order. Of course, God always creates or preserves us in the natural order, too; but in the natural order man's action has something to do with the increase of the habit.

By his sin Adam lost the grace of God. But there is no difference between the grace of Adam before his fall and that which he afterwards received and which we possess through the death and merits of our Lord Jesus Christ. Here the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church is contradictory to that of all the so-called reformers of the sixteenth century, and infinitely more worthy of our conception of the Deity. But to occupy ourselves in this place with their monstrous imaginings would be to lose our way and our time. The grace of God was amissible both to Adam and to Christians. Grace was given and is offered freely, and just as freely man may accept or reject it. If he rejects it, then he is no friend of God. Nor will he be his friend in the life to come. Heaven was closed to all the sons of Adam when he fell. But Christ died, and heaven was opened again. All men may enter there, because all men may obtain and keep the grace of God. All men are called to do so. Christ died for all, and all men are under an obligation to profit by His death.

Here comes a tremendous question. How can they? How can the Negroes of Central Africa, how can the inhabitants of Thibet know of Christ and profit by His grace? How, indeed, to come nearer home, can the majority of the people living all around us know that the Roman Catholic Church is the true church? To be saved we must believe and be baptized. Sometimes we answer questions by recounting a fact. A story then is told of Hermann, the pianist, who was a converted Jew, and who died in the odor of

sanctity. When he was thinking with grief of the death of his Jewish mother, who would not see or speak to him, our Lord made known to him interiorly that He Himself had appeared to the dying lady, declared that He was the Messiah, and she, like St. Paul, believed and was saved. She obtained the baptism of desire. God can communicate His gifts independently of the visible organization which we call the church. How often does He do so? Always, it seems to me, in this sense, that He always offers His grace, the first grace first. If the soul corresponds to that one, then He offers another. Christ died for all, all are under the obligation to lead a supernatural life. Therefore God must offer them His grace. Theologians tell us there is a moment when every man reaching the age of reason is obliged to choose what is morally right or morally wrong. Why should God not give him the grace to choose supernaturally? St. Thomas says that God would send an angel to instruct a well-meaning man rather than let him die in ignorance and sin. The Lord has many angels. What is to prevent them from suggesting thoughts of repentance even to sinning and guilty men? Who knows what takes place between the soul and its Lord at the hour of death? No one has ever told us that. The chief one of His attributes which God was pleased to reveal in the work of creation is that of mercy. The whole work of creation is a manifestation of mercy. This is true of both the natural and the supernatural creation. In the natural order nothing can be more miserable than nothingness itself. Mercy means goodness to misery. To give existence to that which was not is certainly an act of mercy. To give the life of grace is an additional act of mercy. To restore divine charity to the guilty soul black with sin, that surely is a most wonderful act of mercy. And to be desirous to forgive, and willing to forgive again and again and again, that is mercy indeed. But to take the nature of guilty man, and in that nature to die for him, that all men might be saved—who can call in question the proof that the one object of creation was to show a power of being merciful limited only by the divine omnipotence and wisdom itself? We know that all men need this mercy; and, although we cannot sit in judgment on the Almighty, still, when He chooses some souls and rejects others, we know that it is not without reason and justice. We know that always and at all times and under all circumstances this God of infinite charity and of infinite mercy wishes every soul of men to be saved and wishes it intensely. Our God is a God of love. Our God is not only not a tyrant or a selfish being who acts like a kind of blind fate, but to every child that has been formed by His own hand we believe that He is the tenderest of fathers, more loving than a million mothers. Another thing to be remembered is this: we

know positively all that the Church has made known to us dogmatically from revelation, and we know the conclusions which follow necessarily from such premises; but all this is comparatively little. Outside of that little our ignorance is immense. We are like a man who walks out in the morning in a fog; he sees before, behind, to the right and to the left, a little but enough. When we die the fog will be lifted and the whole glorious horizon shall appear distinctly to our satisfied view.

Nevertheless, every man coming into this world is obliged to enter the Roman Catholic Communion. He cannot take this step, however, till he realizes the obligation so to do, nor could any Catholic priest baptize him until he says that such is his conviction. How long persons remain in good faith before entering the Church, how many of them are in a state of grace, how many die outside the visible fold of the Church really in friendship with God, how many, though they may have sinned grievously, repent and are saved, God knows; we do not. This is the safest way to talk on this subject. God alone sees men's hearts. What we do know is—and this is a ground for almost infinite hope—that He is infinitely good, and has perhaps a thousand secret ways of saving souls of which we possess no knowledge. Our duty is to tell people to revere God and to pray, to be ready to give a reason for the faith that is in us, to preach the Gospel if we are priests, to help our neighbors in every way in our power, especially by good example.

But the natural virtues are very beautiful! Undoubtedly they are, as everything is which God has made—the stars, the mountains, the forests, the fields, the sea. And things which God has made in the intellectual and spiritual order are more beautiful than anything in the merely animal or vegetable or mineral kingdom; the song and flight and plumage of birds, the fragrance and bloom of flowers, the brilliancy of the Aurora Borealis, the cataract of Niagara, what are these to the beauty of moral virtue? This moral virtue is the highest gift of God to man—in the natural order. To be brave, to be generous, to be true, to give and to forgive—that is glorious! To take one instance out of the hundreds we read of every day in our papers of man's fidelity to duty, of our firemen or policemen, of life-savers on the seacoast, of locomotive engineers, of that commonest of kinds of heroism which men will never tire of admiring, of physical courage; take the example of that Japanese soldier—he may have been a Christian, most probably he was a pagan—who, when there was no other way, rushed forward and blew up the Chinese breastwork, blowing himself at the same time into eternity. That man was another Arnold Winkelreid. But the natural virtues are not confined to mere animal courage under the

excitement of the enthusiasm of a moment. All the moral virtues can exist in the natural order. And all these virtues are God's gifts. What has man got which he does not owe to his Creator? And his Creator is ready to help him to gain increase and become perfect in the practice of these virtues, too. Only in practice we find that too often the men who have left us examples of the exercise of these heroic gifts were inconsistent. Read Plutarch's lives of his heroes; you will find that those men who at one time were merciful, at another were cruel; he who in one circumstance proves himself chaste, in another shows himself libidinous; and so on. But ordinary Christians cannot reproach the great men of antiquity very much, for they themselves are often little better. And no wonder; for Christians, too, are generally poor travelers who stumble on the way. Only the saints were consistent men.

These natural virtues possess another great, very practical advantage, for they dispose a man to be more fit to receive the gifts of a higher kind. The absence of vice is not a virtue, the presence of natural virtue is not a proof of grace. But certainly if we remove impurities from the water which we drink it is less liable to be injurious to our health. It is clearly a matter of common sense that a soul rich with these natural virtues is a better field in which for God to plant the seed of His grace than a soul which is choked full with the weeds and thorns of vice. Nevertheless God may show Himself liberal to the sinful soul and apparently withhold His mercy from the more upright men. He may do this because he is free. He may do it for reasons simply inscrutable to us at present. He may do it because He sees things in the heart of the so-called naturally just man which displease Him and finds probabilities in the sinful man which appeal to His designs of mercy. Who can understand His ways and who can call Him to account? What we know is this, that not all the natural virtue which has ever been exhibited is equal to a degree of supernatural grace. The grace received by an infant baptized in danger of death deserves a greater recompense than the merits of all the natural acts of virtue of all mankind from the day of Adam till the day of doom. Without it no man shall see God; with it that child shall rejoice in the happiness of His presence during an eternity of glory. More than this, all the valor, patience, self-control, fidelity, truth, benevolence, spirit of sacrifice that have appeared in the history of all men are not worthy, in the sight of God, to deserve one degree of that grace which was first freely given to Adam, but which is now imparted to the believing soul only in virtue of the merits of the blood of Jesus Christ. The first act of faith is a free gift of God. The first supernatural grace, actual grace, the inspiration to pray, is a thing which cannot be bought

of the Holy Spirit by all the combined efforts of a purely natural kind of all the race of men and all the angels of heaven. So that here is a great gulf fixed.

The institution of the sacraments in the Christian Church may throw some additional light on this matter, especially what are called the sacraments of the dead, baptism, penance, extreme unction. Before the coming of our Lord, to be forgiven their sins men were obliged to make acts of perfect contrition. There was no other possible way of obtaining pardon. Now we are forgiven through the sacraments without perfect contrition. How? By acts of natural sorrow? Not a bit. All the natural sorrow in the world will not deserve forgiveness of sin. A man may go to confession with regret for his misdeeds, from excellent motives, but all in the natural order. He may make a good confession, so far as the mere accusation of his faults goes, imagine he has been pardoned, be in perfect good faith and yet remain guilty before God. This is why Catholic theologians have established the distinction between perfect and imperfect contrition. If perfect contrition were necessary, as it was before the time of Christ, then the sacraments would be useless. Mere natural repentance does not count. Therefore they concluded that there were two sorts of sorrow, both of the supernatural kind, one which deserved at once the remission of sin, the other which was imperfect and incomplete in its kind. This latter, however, as it is supernatural also in its origin and character, so disposes the soul that it may be elevated by additional grace to that perfection of repentance which brings with it the infusion of sanctifying grace and charity. It is this additional grace which is received more easily and expeditiously through the sacraments. Probably before the coming of our Lord no Jewish rabbi would have thought of making this distinction in the ways of loving God and grieving for offense against Him. But its reality helps to enlighten us more on the absolute abysm which extends between the highest energy of mere nature and the lightest influence of grace.

This may explain some things apparently unintelligible or which may scandalize persons of weak mind and especially of weak faith. These natural qualities of honesty, industry, sobriety, etc., which are found in men of every religion and no religion at all, deserve some recompense. That recompense cannot be in the life to come. St. Augustin says the Romans were rewarded with the empire of the world for their natural virtues. Why should not nations, and individuals, too, be recompensed in the same way to-day as well as in past times? An individual may become rich, a family may prosper, a nation may obtain a great empire, and this may be the return made by heaven in this life, for their practice of natural virtue,

to those whom God shall call to account for their neglect of supernatural grace in the next.

Then, however, the natural virtues shine out most resplendently when they have been vivified by a supernatural principle. When the hero who fights for his country at the same time fights for God; when he who, knowing that he leaves a wife and children desolate, throws away his own life to save that of others, does it from a motive of religion as well as a natural sense of duty, ah! then you have the grandest thing in man. When the Indians tore out the heart of Father de Brébœuf, burning at the stake, that they might infuse into themselves something of his courage by drinking his blood, it was because Brébœuf was naturally a brave man. But compare his constancy with that of the savages who tortured him. They, from a motive of pride characteristic of their race, would endure every torment without flinching. The priest bore his sufferings with a quiet dignity as superior to the bravado of the savage as his religion was above that of the manitou and the sorcerer. Great are the natural virtues, good are the natural virtues; but it is because the Creator intended that, in the present disposition of things, they should be elevated to a higher plane, so that by their use the souls of men should not only give greater glory to God on earth, but earn higher crowns for themselves in heaven. By all means let us admire everything that is good in our neighbors and give them credit for it, and let us try to practise ourselves all the moral virtues, only with a supernatural motive.

This article would not be complete without some more direct allusion to the momentous question of the distribution of grace. The scholastic theologians tell us that all questions end in mystery. If there be anything, then, which is a mystery to the human mind, it is this most serious question of the distribution of grace. Why does God give so much to some and so much more to others? If Christ died for all, why are not all saved? It is the same question and the same mystery as the permission of evil. Why does God permit suffering, sin, the loss of souls? Why was Abel innocent and Cain a reprobate? Here we can only bow down our heads and adore, knowing that God is not unjust. He would not force the human will. He permits evil to draw from it greater good. To save the fallen race of Adam, Christ became man. But there was no special incarnation for the race of Cain. On the contrary, God tells us that He will punish the sins of parents on their children to the third and fourth generation, while he will show mercy to thousands of those who love and serve Him. God would not force the human will. With infinite prescience He knows which is the proper and fitting grace to give to every soul. That grace is always sufficient

for salvation, probably superabundantly sufficient. If the soul corresponds with the grace which it receives, that grace becomes efficacious, and if the soul preserves and corresponds to its final grace, it will be saved.

But here comes in another consideration. Do we know that we correspond with the grace of God? Absolutely, with a positive knowledge, no. The grace of God and the whole supernatural order is something insensible and invisible. We cannot be conscious of the presence and the action of grace. The supernatural world is something nature and our natural faculties cannot be cognizant of. We can conclude the presence of grace, however, by its evident effects. By their fruits ye shall know them. A good tree produces good fruit. Those who live up to the norm and standard of Christian ethics we may believe to be actuated by the Christian spirit. But this is only a guess, a probability or what is called broadly a moral certitude. No man knows, the Scripture says, whether he be worthy of love or hate. My conscience reproaches me nothing, says St. Paul, yet not therefore am I justified. God alone sees the heart; we do not know our own. Not that this possibility of doubt should discourage us. In this life, in almost every business, we must act on probabilities, and in the all-important business of our salvation we must act on this moral certitude, this great probability. If we live in doubt and darkness, we know that God is good and wise, merciful and loving. It is well for us that we should be in a state of incertitude in this life; it stirs us to exertion and vigilance and keeps us in God's holy fear and in a salutary humility. More than this, even if we were aware that we were now, this moment, in God's friendship, we know not what the future may bring about. Therefore we can despise no one. We can never say, like the Pharisee, I am righteous and this man a sinner. And even if we did know that we were in God's grace and our neighbor in a state of sin, we know not how it will be to-morrow, and especially when the end comes. We may yet be reprobates, we may have a comparatively low place in heaven, and he whom we now despise may be high up among God's blessed in the celestial hierarchies.

In the light of eternity all God's ways will be made evident and plain. Now and here even an almost infinitely beautiful variety manifests itself in the distribution of his natural gifts, subject to some hidden unity of plan; the day will come when His ways in the spiritual world will be justified before all men, and we shall see that all was well and all was wise and all was done in goodness. Meanwhile we must not allow ourselves to be influenced by the Thomas-like incredulity of those who fear to believe—and fear to hope—because with moles' eyes they cannot

pierce the sun. To be men as well as Christians we must stand by what is certain, no matter how many difficulties present themselves to our exceedingly weak intellect in the explanation of details. God is necessarily, absolutely, infinitely good; He loves all things that He has made, He wishes all men to be saved, and Christ died for all, and the God-man did this with a charity so great that all the angels that could ever possibly be created would not begin even to appreciate it. So we must conclude that, whether men correspond with these designs or not, it is the ardent wish of heaven that all mankind should lead a supernatural life and enjoy in the hereafter a supernatural reward. Therefore if any of us come to grief, not only will it be by our own fault, but in spite of earnest, careful, sincere, to speak humanly, whole-hearted efforts on the part of our Creator to prevent our going astray. Short of forcing the human will, and so far as is consistent with the dictates of his omniscient judgment in the organization of things which he has chosen to establish, He endeavors to make every one lead a supernatural life, kindly and energetically, infusing into men's souls, as the beginning of wisdom, His holy fear, but wishing them to love Him with a love, if possible, as boundless as His own beauty, goodness and immeasurable mercy.

D. A. Merrick, S. J.

New York, N. Y.

THE MYSTIC RITES OF ELEVSIS.

In many natural religions there are performed at certain recurrent festivals and on the occasion of portentous events, peculiar clandestine and orgiastic rites which may be witnessed only by members of the clan or brotherhood. Secret ceremonies of this kind were not absent from the old Hellenic religions. Of all mystic sanctuaries to which only properly qualified and duly approved spectators were admitted, the most celebrated in the classic ages and in subsequent history was the shrine of the twain goddesses at Elevsis.[1]

Investigators are unable to date the first beginnings of this Attic town of Elevsis. However, the discovery of prehistoric tombs near its ancient citadel indicate that it was well inhabited in the second millenium before Christ. Its advantageous position made it a centre of opulence. It owned the fertile Rharian fields which stretch westward along the sea towards the Megarid, and the equally productive plain of Thria which extends eastward along the road to Athens.

[1] Pavsanias Description of Greece, 10, 31, 11; Diodoros Historical Library, 5, 4; 5, 77.

Through Elevsis passed the chief overland route between Attika and the rest of Greece. Its secure harbor made it an acceptable commercial station for the Phœnicians and other roving merchants of the eastern Mediterranean. The waters of its expansive bay teemed with fishes and sea fruit. But more than six hundred years before the beginning of our era the Elevsinians lost their independence and were absorbed in the Athenian Commonwealth. This change, instead of proving detrimental to their local religious practices, rather contributed to their preservation and further development. For the Elevsinian cult was adopted by the victorious Athenians and became part of the State religion.

The divinities in whose commemoration the mystic rites were performed are most popularly known through a fable called "the anthology," which has often been retold by poets and mythologists.[2] The divine Persephone while romping with the daughters of the ocean in the flowery fields of Nisa is kidnapped by Polydegmon or Plouton, the King of the Dead, and carried off to become his consort and to reign with him forever in his silent halls. Her forlorn mother, Demeter, not knowing what fate had befallen Persephone, travels the earth in search of her. The Sun, who was the only witness to Polydegmon's act, finally revealed the facts. Thereupon Demeter, in her displeasure, wandered off to Elevsis, where she revealed herself to Keleos the King, and caused him to build a temple sacred to her. In this temple she took up her abode, refusing to return to Olympos and to associate with the other gods until after her daughter was restored to her. She sent a destructive drought and blight over the earth, and it ceased to give forth its fruits. The human race was about to perish through famine, and then there would be no men to honor the gods by sacrifice. To avert these impending calamities a reconciliation was effected through the mediation of Zevs. Persephone was to stay for nine months of every year in the company of her mother, and for the remaining three was to reign with her gloomy husband over the inane souls of the departed.

This myth, like the mystic cult based upon it, underwent various changes during the successive ages. How and when it began cannot be ascertained. Perhaps it was brought to Elevsis from Krete, as Gruppe confidently states.[3] At least in later times the Kretans are reported as believing that the worship of Demeter had, like other Attic cults, been transplanted from their island into Attika.[4] Accepting the Kretan provenance of the cult, the ninth century before Christ may be assigned as the epoch during which the Elevsinian

---

[2] Homeric Hymn to Demeter; Apollodoros, Bibliotheke, 1, 5, 1; Ovid, Fasti, 4, 417-618; Metamorphoses, 5, 358-408; Claudian, De raptu Proserpinae. [3] Griechische Mythologie und Religions geschichte, p. 17. [4] Diodoros Historical Library, 5, 77; Cf. Hymn to Demeter, 122-123.

sanctuary was established. But if Foucart's reasoning be correct, the cult is still older, and came from Egypt in the epoch of the Pharaos of the eighteenth dynasty, sixteen or seventeen hundred years before our era.[5] The earliest literary mention of this sanctuary is in the hymn to Demeter, which was composed towards the close of the seventh century. The hymn shows, however, that the rites were then already venerably ancient. It also refers to their mystic character and to the blissful fate of all mortals to whose lot falls the happiness of being initiated into them. In the most primitive stages of their existence these mysteries were probably religious ceremonies performed at a shrine belonging to a few of the prominent families of Elevsis. Circumstances now unknown added some special virtue or glory to these rites, and the privilege of participating in them was extended to other Elevsinians. In historic times two Elevsinian families, the Evmolpids and the Keryks, possessed the secret of the mysteries by ancient inheritance transmitted from generation to generation. They conducted the mystic rites and presided over all the acts of initiation. It may therefore easily be supposed that those who originally established this cult in Elevsis were the progenitors of the Evmolpids and Keryks.

In the anthologic myth there are survivals of two kinds of primitive cult. Demeter, the corn Lady, and Persephone, the seed which annually remains hidden in the earth for a third of the year, are deities which naturally belong to agrarian rites; while Plouton, as the dark receiver and possessor of the dead, is a divinity closely connected with the worship of ancestors. In their later development the Elevsinian mysteries grew into a series of magnificent ceremonies which bore very slight resemblance to rites of such an origin. But, nevertheless, the emphatic and exceptional way in which these mysteries nourished the hope that after death the human soul survives, recalls these primitive agrarian and funereal practices, and may be explained by thinking that some resemblance was seen between the fate of mortals after death and of the seed which is covered and hidden in the earth, but does not lose its vitality.

The shrine of Demeter and Kore, her daughter, must have been highly revered in the seventh century before Christ. On that account the Athenians, when they annexed Elevsis to their territory, incorporated the rites of these goddesses into the State religion of Athens. This official act occasioned a number of modifications in the Elevsinian cult. Presence at the celebration of the mysteries, and participation in them, was no longer the exclusive privilege of the Elevsinians. Any Athenian citizen, any inhabitant of Attika, might under prescribed conditions be initiated and allowed to enjoy

[5] Recherches sur l'origine et la nature des mystères d'Elevsis, p. 75.

all the blessings that the mysteries could give. For the accommodation of the increased number of participants a larger temple or hall had to be constructed at Elevsis. Mystic rites of this kind could not be performed in the open air, like most other Hellenic religious exercises. The preliminary and preparatory rites and purifications and sacrifices which each candidate had to fulfil before being received into the temple of Demeter and her daughter were hereafter to take place not at Elevsis, but at Athens. And after the completion of these preparatory ceremonies then all who were to see the mysteries went in sacred procession on a fixed day from Athens to Elevsis.

When the armies of Xerxes invaded Greece, in 480 before Christ, they pillaged and burned the sanctuary of Demeter,[6] where the mystic ceremonies used to be celebrated in Elevsis. But immediately after their departure the sanctuary was restored and the rites were continued. By their wise and patriotic conduct in the struggle against the Persian invaders the Athenians created for themselves the well-merited reputation of being the foremost and most enviable of all the inhabitants of the Greek world. Athens was for the Greeks what Paris once was for the inhabitants of Europe. The Athenians were regarded as models in everything that related to the higher and more cultivated and more spiritual life.[7] From all quarters of the Hellenic world candidates applied for admission to the Elevsinian rites. The extension of the privilege to all Greeks, whether Athenians or not, must have occurred shortly after the Persian wars, if not even earlier.[8] Herodotos and Isokrates and others refer to it as to an established practice. And about 440 B. C., so widely recognized were the claims of the Elevsinian sanctuary that the Athenians passed a law regulating the manner in which the annual regular offerings of first fruits were to be delivered. These gifts Athens seems to have confidently expected and received for the sanctuary, not only from her allies, but also from many of the other independent Greek States.[9]

No amount of investigation will ever reconstruct for us a complete picture of what took place at these mysteries. The obligation of secrecy which was imposed on every candidate for admission was never openly violated. Two chief considerations checked all indiscreetness in this direction. Whoever dared to divulge what he saw and heard within the holy walls not only committed an offense against religion and thus exposed himself to the vengeance of the gods, but also made himself a culprit before the laws of the State and liable to punishment by death. Those who knew the mysteries never conversed about them without first assuring themselves that

[6] Herodotos, 9, 65. [7] Cf. Thoukydides, 7, 63, lines 12-14, ed. Bœhme, 1864. [8] Cf. Herodotos, 8, 65; Isokrates, Panegyric, 46, a-c; Libanios, Korinthiac Oration, 4, p. 356. [9] Dittenberger, Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum, 2d ed., No. 13.

no initiated person was within hearing.[10] In the year 421 the enemies of Alkibiades succeeded in having sentence of death passed against him by accusing him of different crimes, the principal one, and perhaps the only one mentioned in the official indictment, being that with a number of riotous companions he had one night parodied and ridiculed the rites of Elevsis.[11]

About the year 315 B. C. a young man named Theodoros was sitting and chatting with Evrykleides, the hierophant of the mysteries. Theodoros, wishing to tease his solemn companion, said that every hierophant was guilty of the crime of revealing the mysteries because when accepting postulants and initiating them the hierophant always imparted to them a knowledge of the secrets. Evrykleides, however, refused to regard the mysteries as a suitable topic for pleasantry. He brought an accusation of impiety against the wit-loving philosopher. Theodoros was condemned to die by drinking hemlock, but perhaps the sentence was remitted through the influence of the archon Demetrios of Phaleron.[12] Pavsanias, who as an intelligent and curious tourist was disposed to describe in detail the architecture and much of the history of the shrines of the two goddesses in Athens and Elevsis, suddenly cuts off his description with the remark that in a dream he had been directed not to proceed further in this respect.[13]

But notwithstanding this severe reticence regarding everything connected with these hidden rites, it is quite probable that something of what was to be seen and heard within the hall of initiation became known even to the "profane." Early Christian writers, in their attacks on paganism, refer to the mysteries and mention rites and formulas peculiar to them. This fact indicates that these ecclesiastical scholars, although not initiated in the mysteries, were nevertheless acquainted with them, at least partially. And their statements concerning the performances and utterances that constituted part of the mystic services are one of our chief sources of information.

As a welcome supplement to the rare and meagre bits of information scattered throughout the ancient texts come some interesting facts furnished by archæological research. A few antique vases have been found in Italy and Greece which are decorated with scenes illustrative of mystic initiation ceremonies. Scientific excavations made at Elevsis have laid bare the foundations of the ancient hall where the initiations took place, and of the other shrines and edifices belonging in some way or other to the Elevsinian cult. A number of inscriptions found at Elevsis and others found at Athens give precise information concerning many of the outward features of the

[10] Platon, Theaetetos, 155 e. [11] Thoukydides, 6, 28, 53, 60-61; Andokides, On the Mysteries, 11; Ploutarch, Life of Alkibiades, 19, 22. [12] Diogenes Laertios, Lives of the Philosophers, 2, 101. [13] Pavsanias, 1, 14, 2-3.

celebrations. And pieces of sculpture representing the divinities worshiped in these rites assist in teaching us the nature of the divinities in question and therefore also the nature of the cult by which they were worshiped.

In the fifth century and ever thereafter the postulant went through three sets of ceremonies or three stages of initiation. In the city of Athens he was admitted to what may be called the "first degree;" a few months later he went to Elevsis and entered the first degree of the Elevsinian branch, or the second degree of the full series; and after the lapse of a year he again presented himself at Elevsis for the highest and last degree.[14] The entire process was about as follows:

For several consecutive days in Anthesterion, the vernal month of flowers, the Athenians annually celebrated within the city a festival in honor of Demeter and Kore. The rites performed at this festival were not open to the public and might be witnessed only by accepted and ritually prepared postulants. To distinguish them from the greater celebration at Elevsis these less important ones were known as the "Little" or "Lesser Mysteries."[15] From the name of the locality where the temple stood in which these Little Mysteries took place they were also known as the "Mysteries in Agrae."[16] Strangers who undertook the journey to Athens as postulants for admission were protected from all molestation, even in time of war, by a truce which lasted about fifty-five days.[17] As a preparation for beholding the ceremonies each candidate bathed himself in a way prescribed by ritual in the River Ilisos,[18] and offered certain propitiatory sacrifices. The purificatory rites may have varied according to the needs of the candidates. Those who were guilty of deeds of blood and of other heavy crimes, if they had never been ritualistically purified, were not admitted. This exclusion[19] of unfit candidates and preparation of others by a purification adapted to their condition, presupposes some kind of confession of grave sins. After witnessing the secret rites each candidate was known as an "initiate" or "myst." Concerning the mysteries at Agrae no further and deeper information is available. In later times, in order to accommodate the great numbers of strangers who presented themselves for initiation, these lesser mysteries were sometimes celebrated twice in the same year,[20] for no one might enter the Great Mysteries without previously being prepared by acceptance into those at Agrae.[21]

Every autumn, in the month of Boedromion,[22] the mystic rites

[14] Ploutarch, Life of Demetrios, 26. [15] Polyaenos, 5, 17; Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum, I., p. 4 n. 1 B. [16] Ploutarch, Life of Demetrios, 26; Kleitodemos, in Müller's Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum, I., 359; Dionysius Periegetes, 424; Himerios, in Photios' Bibliotheke, 1,119; Polyaenetos, 5, 17. [17] C. I. A., 1 p., 4 n., 1 B. [18] Polyaenos, 5, 17; Clement of Alexandreia, Strom. 5, 689. [19] Theon Smyrnaeos, 14, 20-25; Celsus, apud Origenem, 253, ed. Koetschau. [20] Inscription in the Ephemeris Archæologike, 1887, p. 177. [21] Clement of Alexandria, Strom. 5, 204, ed. Sylburg. [22] Ploutarch, Demetrios, 26; Phokion, 6; Alexander, 31.

were performed at Elevsis. Every four years they were celebrated with exceptional magnificence[23] and accompanied by agonistic contests. Long before the time appointed for the beginning of the festival messengers sent out from Athens announced the sacred truce to all the neighboring States.[24] The celebration lasted about twelve days. The first few days were devoted to preparation. On the 14th of the month certain sacred and precious objects which were needed in Athens for the preparatory days of the festival, and which when not in use were kept carefully hidden in the sanctuary at Elevsis, were carried by priestesses to Athens and deposited in a holy house called the Elevsinion, near the Akropolis. These objects were probably vestments and utensils used in the performing of the sacred rites and also certain objects connected with the worship of Iakchos, whose cult had been associated with that of Demeter and Kore. Perhaps, also, statues representing these divinities were among these sacra. From an inscription[25] we learn that in the second century of our era it was customary for a company of young Athenian knights to constitute a mounted guard of honor accompanying these venerable sacra from Elevsis to Athens. The bearers of the sacra were escorted part of the way by the people of Elevsis, and on their approach to the city they were met by the people of Athens, who accompanied them to the Elevsinion with acclamations of pious welcome. As soon as these objects had been placed in the temporary repository in the Elevsinion the phædyntes, or official who had charge of them, announced the fact to the priestess of Athena, the tutelary goddess of the city, and with this announcement the festival began.[26]

On the following day the mysts who intended to go to Elevsis were convoked into an assembly to hear the warning against all who were guilty of manslaughter or other heinous offenses[27] and all who by reason of other prohibitions might not be initiated. Women possessed equally with men the privilege of initation. Children were received into the Little Mysteries, and possibly also into those of the first night at Elevsis. It seems that slaves of Greek descent were also occasionally allowed to participate.[28] This condescension in favor of the slaves is the more remarkable because as a rule slaves were not allowed to associate on equal terms with free citizens in religious rites at Athens.[29] Barbarians were strictly excluded.[30]

Each postulant, in order to be accepted and to receive instruction, placed himself under the guidance of a mystagogue.[31] The mysta-

[23] Aristotle, Polity of Athens, 54; C. I. A., III., 663. [24] Aeschynes, 2, 133; Dittenberger, Syll. Inscr. Gr., 2d ed., 646. [25] C. I. A., III., 1 p., 5 n, 5. [26] C. I. A., III., 5. [27] Polydevkes, 8, 90; Theon of Smyrna, p. 22, ed. Dupuis. [28] C. I. A., II., 834 b; Theophilos, in scholion to Dionysios Thrax, p. 724. [29] Philon, That every honest man is free, 20, p. 468 M. [30] Isokrates, Panegyric, 73, d-e. [31] C. I. A., IV., 1, I. supplement, p. 3 f.

gogue was by descent a member of either the Evmolpid or the Keryk family. Perhaps such postulants as were rejected by the mystagogues might make a final appeal to the hierophant. Or perhaps the hierophant might reject candidates even when introduced and recommended by a mystagogue. In the year 31 of our era the celebrated wonder-worker, Apollonios of Tyana, came to Athens and requested the privilege of initiation; but the hierophant hesitated, saying that the gates of Elevsis were not open to magicians who communed with unclean spirits.[32] But Apollonios was later admitted. It may be that occasionally the hierophants were put to their wits' ends to observe the strict law and yet accept candidates who though debarred for some cause or other could not recklessly be turned away. When Demetrios came from Asia and won the temporary gratitude of the Greeks by driving the Makedonians out of the Peloponnesos, he sent a message to the Athenians saying that he was about to arrive in their city and that he desired initiation into all the degrees of the mysteries. The Athenians, unable to expect the hierophants to violate the law which ordained that the first initiation should take place in springtime and the second in autumn and the third in the autumn of the following year, removed all difficulties by means of a wonderful casuistic juggling with the official calendar. They decreed that the month of Demetrios' arrival in Athens should for the nonce be officially known as the spring month Anthesterion, and that after the Prince had received the first initiation in the Little Mysteries, this same month should immediately take on the name of the autumn month Boedromion, and that after the complete initiation was over this polyonymous month should reassume its own proper name.[33]

The candidates underwent some fixed kind of probation and preparation. They performed certain purificatory ablutions in the sea[34] and offered prescribed propitiatory sacrifices, including that of a sacred pig. Magnificent sacrifices were also offered by the Archon Basilevs to bring the favors of the gods upon the Senate, the citizens of Athens, their wives and children. In commemoration of Demeter's nine days' wandering and grief in search of Persephone, the mysts fasted for nine days. Perhaps this fast consisted in eating nothing between sunrise and sunset; perhaps it was merely an abstinence from certain kinds of food, as from meat, fish, beans, pomegranates and apples.[35] These various rites and practices all belonged to the first days of the festival and were all performed at Athens.

---

[32] Philostratos, Life of Apollonios, 4, 17. [33] Ploutarch, Demetrios, 26. [34] Ploutarch, Life of Phokion, 28; Polyaenetos, 3, 11. [35] Porphyrios, De abstin. carn. 4, 16; Aelian History of Animals, 9, 65; Ploutarch, de solert, anim. 35, 11; Pavsanias, 1, 37, 3; 8, 15, 1.

On the twentieth[36] day of the month the mysts went in gorgeous procession from Athens to Elevsis, where the most sacred and secret part of the rites were to be accomplished. They were accompanied by their friends, by the mystagogues, by a military escort of ephebs and by a multitude of men, women and children who took part in the pilgrimage out of piety towards the gods or out of simple curiosity. Thirty thousand may not be an exaggerated number to represent this crowd.[37] By consecrated custom the journey was made on foot. This was not a light undertaking, for the Sacred Way which joins Athens and Elevsis measures more than eleven miles. When Athens became opulent and luxurious it began to grow common for richer individuals, especially fashionable ladies and courtesans, to accompany the procession in carriages.[38] In order to abolish this growing fashion Lykourgos introduced a law forbidding it and imposing a heavy fine on all who might violate the law. Lykourgos himself was the first to pay the fine, for his wife was the first to offend against the law.[39] The mysts wore crowns of myrtle,[40] for myrtle was sacred to Demeter and Kore as being chthonic deities. In later times they usually dressed in garments of white.[41] Each man carried a torch, which was to be lighted at nightfall.[42]

In this procession the sacred objects which had been brought to Athens a few days previously were carried back to Elevsis by priests and priestesses and attendants. But the holiest object in the procession was a statue of the young god Iakchos, a sort of agricultural and orgiastic deity, whose worship had been combined with that of Demeter and Kore ever since the cult of Elevsis had become portion of the religion of Athens. According to one myth, he was the son of Persephone. Specially designated officials had charge of the processional car which carried the statue. In a kind of ecstatic frenzy the great multitude kept singing and shouting the name of this god, "Iakch, O Iakchos, Iakch, O Iakchos."[43] It seems that the statue was needed in the performance of the secret rites. No other reason explains why it should thus be brought to Elevsis.

Along the Sacred Way there were holy places, shrines, altars and temples at which the pilgrims stopped and performed acts of worship.[44] These delays so retarded their advance that night came on three or four hours before they reached Elevsis. Their last station was at Krokon's Castle, a village near the ancient confines of Athenian and Elevsinian territory. Here the descendants of the mythic hero Krokon, who inhabited this village, distributed saffron-colored

[36] Ploutarch, Life of Camillus, 19; of Phokion, 28; Scholion to Aristophanes, Frogs, 324. [37] Herodotos, 8, 65. [38] Aristophanes, Ploutos, 1013-1015; Demosthenes, Against Meidias, 158. [39] Pseudo-Ploutarch, Lives of the Ten Orators, 7, 14-15. [40] Scholion to Aristophanes, Frogs, 330. [41] C. I. A., III., 1,132. [42] Himerios, Oration, 7, 2, ed. Dübner. [43] Aristophanes, Frogs, 316. [44] Ploutarch, Life of Alkibiades, 34.

ribbons, and each myst tied one of these round his right arm and another round his left leg.[45] Shortly after this ceremony night came on, and the thirty thousand lighted their immense torches.[46] They entered Elevsis towards midnight. After feasting and dancing and singing for some two or three hours longer each one found some corner in which to rest as well as he could from his fatigue and regain strength for the great rites which were to begin on the evening of the coming day.

On the following night all who had a right to be received into the first mysteries at Elevsis, or the second degree in the entire mystic series, gathered into the great Telesterion, or Temple of the Twain Goddesses. Modern excavations and investigations at Elevsis prove that at least three times this temple had been rebuilt, and each time on a larger scale. The newest of the three was built in the fourth century and could accommodate about three thousand sitters, being about one hundred and seventy feet square. If one-tenth of those who came to Elevsis in the procession were postulants, then this Telesterion could contain them all at one sitting. Certain preliminary ceremonies took place outside of the Telesterion,[47] but within a great enclosure shut off from the eyes of the "profane." Here probably the warning against all uninitiated was repeated.[48] We do not know what precautions were taken to be certain that no uninitiated intruders entered the Telesterion. Only one instance is known when outsiders succeeded in passing within this mystic Temple. They were two young countrymen from Akarnania. They were put to death.[49] After ascertaining that none save mysts were present the obligation of secrecy was enjoined.[50] They then passed into the Mystic Temple.

Within this hall the mysts were made to experience the most blood-curdling sensations of horror and the most enthusiastic ecstasy of joy.[51] No lamps were burning to illuminate the hall. The weak light that dimly entered through the openings in the roof was on these moonless nights insufficient to allow the mysts to locate themselves in the spacious room or to recognize each other. They became a frightened crowd.[52] The interminable suspense of the awe-stricken and groping mysts was at intervals relieved and prevented from turning into madness by occasional mystic phrases uttered by some unseen priest reminding them that their gropings were commemorative of the wanderings of Demeter in search of her lost daughter, and that these horrors would therefore finally turn to some

---

[45] Stephanos Byzantios, s. v. "krokoo;" Bekker, Anecdota, p. 273. [46] Scholion to Sophokles, Œdipous at Kolonos, 1048. [47] Themistios, Oration 5, 71 a. [48] Loukian, Alexander, 38. [49] Livy, 31, 14. [50] Sopatros, in Walz ed. of Greek Rhetors, 8, 118; Clement of Alexandreia, Protreptika, 1, 10. [51] Aristeides, Elevsinian Oration, p. 256. [52] Cf. Ploutarch, On the Soul, 2, 5, ed. Dübner.

mysterious delight. It is probable that in later times tableaux were shown in the dim light, representing scenes in the Under World.[53] In the midst of this oppressive darkness a voice cries out in joy. Demeter is represented as having found her daughter. Brazen gongs resound.[54] The doors of a sanctuary filled with dazzling light[55] are swept open. The dazed mysts behold resplendent images of the gods, gorgeous priests, glorious scenes. The second and ecstatic act of the drama has begun.

The secret rites seem to have been really the enacting of a great and thrilling drama, in which the mysts, though not the chief actors, were nevertheless not entirely passive. The scenes enacted were taken from the local Elevsinian myth as it had been preserved by tradition in the sacred families of the Evmolpids and Keryks regarding Demeter's grief for her lost daughter and her joy when Persephone was restored to her.[56] The myth as employed in the Mysteries was supposed to differ from the common legend in many details and to be fully known only to the initiated, and to reveal it would be sacrilegious.[57] But, nevertheless, since nearly all Athenians were initiated, the secret myth thus became a common piece of knowledge, and some of its details have entered into literature. It was chiefly a drama of action and of wondrous sights, interrupted now and then by the chanting of legends, or when the actors of the drama occasionally enunciated mystic and symbolic formulas. This prevailing silence increased the mysterious and impressive nature of the rites.

Of the officials who presented the mystic drama, the principal ones were the hierophant, the torch-bearer, the altar priest and the holy herald. In a certain portion of the drama the hierophant represented the Demiourg or Creator of the universe, the torch-bearer acted the part of the light-giving Sun, the altar priest represented the moon and the herald impersonated the messenger god Hermes.[58] The hierophant was the most important personage, the grand master. He was appointed from among the Evmolpids and held the position for life.[59] When ordained to this office he renounced his individual name and became hieronymous, being usually known and spoken of simply as "the hierophant."[60] It would seem that he lived a life of strict chastity.[61] For the performance of the duties of his office it was regarded as necessary that he possess a good voice.[62] This

[53] Ploutarch, On the Soul, in Stobaeos' Florilegium, 120, 28, iv., p. 107, 27ff.; Loukian, Kataplous, 22. [54] Scholion to Theokritos, Eidyll 2, 36; Apollodoro, fragm. 36 in Fragmenta Hist. Graec. ed. Didot, 1, 434. [55] Cf. Dion Chrysostom, Oration 12, p. 387, ed. Reiske. [56] Gregory Nazianzene, Oration 39, 4; Clement of Alexandreia, Protreptika, 4, 27, ed. Migne. [57] Isokrates, Panegyric, 28. [58] Evsebios, Preparation for the Gospel, 3, 12. [59] Pavsanias, 2, 14, 1; Ephemeris Archæologike, 1883, p. 81, 8; 1895, p. 119. [60] Loukian, Lexiphanes, 10; Evnapios, Life of Maximus, 475, ed. Dübner. [61] St. Jerome, Epist. 123, 905; Arrian Epiktetos' dissertations, 3, 21. [62] Philostratos, Lives of the Sophists, 2, 20.

requisite quality probably refers to the masterly manner in which he was expected to sing his parts in the mystic drama.

When the doors of the sanctuary were swung open and the blazing light streamed out upon the initiated a feeling of blissful consolation took possession of the assembled multitude. Before the eyes of the spectators the hierophant and other sacred persons robed in glittering vestments continued performing mystic rites. According to the Elevsinian version of the wanderings of Demeter, when the goddess arrived in the house of Keleos, the King of Elevsis, she refused all offers of refreshing nourishment until finally, recalled from her moody sadness and made to smile by the humorous remarks of the maid Iambe, she ordered that a beverage be prepared for her from meal and water.[63] In commemoration of this mixture which the goddess drank the mysts after their fatiguing gropings in darkness received and tasted of a similar beverage called the "kykeon."[64] They also seem to have partaken of some kind of food.

After these holier ceremonies were over, and the mysts had seen and venerated and even touched such of the sacred objects as were to be shown to the initiates of the first night, proceedings of a less decorous nature seem to have followed. These were exhibitions and words which served to recall the pleasantries of Iambe[65] in the presence of Demeter. In other forms of the legend the girl who caused Demeter to smile was called Bavbo. And the fragmentary information which has been preserved concerning Bavbo is of such a nature that it tends to justify the attacks of the early Christian writers who often accused the pagans of having immoral rites in their mysteries.[66] Still it is probable that the impersonation of Bavbo in the mysteries was rather coarsely humoristic than really immoral.

From the sketch just given some notion may be formed regarding the proceedings that took place on the night when the first set of Elevsinian mysteries was enacted and made known to the initiated. On the following night a second series of similar revelations were shown. But to these none were admitted save such as had received the lower initiation a year before.[67] The mysts who witnessed these higher mysteries received the title of "epopts." Since the name merely means "beholders," it indicates that in these as in the mysteries of the preceding night the rites consisted more in acts than in words. The greatest event of this night was the "showing of the sacra," an act from which the hierophant received his title. In this ceremony the doors of the anaktoron or penetralia were opened.

[63] Hymn to Demeter, 200-211. [64] Clement of Alexandreia, Protreptika, p. 18, ed. Potter. [65] Apollodoros, Bibliotheke, 1, 5, 1-3; Nikandros, Alexipharmikon, 128-132, and scholion thereto; Proklos, Chrestomatheia, apud Photium, Bibliotheke, 319; Etymologicum Magnum, s. v. "Iambe." [66] Clement of Alexandreia, Protreptika, 2, 77 f; Arnobius, adversus Gentes, 5, 26. [67] Ploutarch, Life of Demetrios, 26.

No one might enter here save the hierophant alone.[68] He stood at a holy table, upon and near which were the mysterious and much revered sacra. These the hierophant exposed one by one and held up to the worshiping gaze of the beholders. Decorations, drapery, illumination, incense increased the illusion and added to the magnificence. The epopts rivetted their eyes on the holy objects in awe and silence approaching to fear.[69] We do not know with certainty what these sacra were, but it seems probable that they were statues of the gods and sacred relics of different kinds. They must have included those sacred objects which had a few days before been carried with such pomp to Athens and then back to Elevsis in the Iakchos procession.

Perhaps it is in this part of the initiation that the notorious hierogamic scene took place, in which the marriage of Plouton and Persephone and the birth of Iakchos was represented.[70] The hierophant and the priestess of Demeter, acting the parts of Plouton and Persephone, descended into a dark retreat to represent the manner in which Persephone had been carried off to the kingdom of the god of the Under World.[71] On returning to the sanctuary the hierophant proclaimed that "the great lady Brimo has brought forth the divine Brimos,"[72] probably announcing by this formula the mystic birth of Ikachos, the son of Plouton and Persephone. Probably they carried up from the hidden retreat an image of the young Iakchos and placed it in a cradle which as one of the "sacred objects" was waiting to receive him.

Like the details concerning Bavbo, this gamic scene and another scene, from which nothing has been preserved except the words "Hye Kye," that is, "descend in rain, O Zevs, and generate,"[73] and another detail representing perhaps the birth of an Elevsinian hero called Evboulevs,[74] have been attacked as indecorous. All that can be said in extenuation of the evident strangeness of these details is that they appealed to the ancient Greeks in a way absolutely different from the manner in which they would affect people of to-day imbued with more careful principles of morality. The attacks of the ecclesiastical writers were certainly justifiable.

In commemoration of the fact that it was Demeter who first taught the inhabitants of Elevsis how to sow grain and to prepare food from it, heads of wheat were distributed to the epopts, who received them in silence and reverence. This was regarded as one of the most en-

[68] Aelian, Fragm. 12, ed. Didot. [69] Ploutarch, De Profect. Virt. sent., p. 258. [70] Scholion to Platon's Gorgias, 497 c. [71] Tertullian ad Gentes, 2, 7; Asterios, Encomium of the Martyrs, 113 b.; Cf. also Origen, Philosophoumena, V. 1, 171; Servus ad Vergilii Aeneid. 6, 661; Scholion to Perseus, Satire 5, 145; St. Jerome adv. Jovin. 1, 49. [72] Hippolytos, Refutatio Heres. 5, 8; Origen, Philosophoumena, V. 1, 171. [73] Origen, Philosophoumena, V. 1, 171. [74] Scholion to Aristeides, 22; Orphic Hymn, 41, 5-9.

nobling events of the mystic rites.[75] And with this ceremony the epoptic initiation ended.

It is quite clear from abundant literary testimony that the general final effect of initiation in the mysteries was elevating and consoling. The principal convictions which the initiated carried away with them seem to have been that in the continued existence of the soul after death the initiated would have a happier lot than the darkness and punishments which awaited the "profane." From the first beginnings of Greek literary history down to the last days of pagan Hellenism high-flighted poets, thoughtful philosophers and careful historians agree in sounding the praises of the graces bestowed by these mysteries.[76] But the lesson taught at Elevsis seems to have been one of enthusiastic emotions and impressive suggestions rather than of intellectual conviction. No well defined and formulated doctrines were taught, except in later times, when neo-Platonic philosophy held the ascendency in Athens, and some of its precepts were perhaps incorporated into the Elevsinian cult; for in those later days there were hierophants who had become members of this philosophical school. Initiation into the mysteries imposed no obligation of thereafter leading a better life. According to the opinion of the initiate, they would enjoy happiness after death not as a reward for any good or noble acts while on earth, but purely as a grace proceeding from the mysteries.

In his famous painting on the walls of the Lesche in Delphi, representing the Under World, the artist Polygnotos represented some women as condemned to keep forever trying to fill bottomless tubs with water, because they had while on earth neglected to be initiated.[77] The cynic philosopher Diogenes turned his sarcasm against the Elevsinian rites because pickpockets and rentgatherers if initiated would have a happier future than Epameinondas, who had not provided himself with the favor of the mysteries.[78] Philo the Jew objected to them on the same grounds.[79] But the cynic scoffer and the Hebrew follower of Platon did not represent the common Hellenic feeling in regard to Elevsis, as is evident from the multitudes who crowded thither for initiation every year for more than ten centuries, and which even in the last days of Hellenic paganism "was a bond of union in the human race."[80] For few indeed are those who viewed the question of secret doings with the philosophic independence of Demonax, who would not be initiated because he thought

[75] Clement of Alexandreia, Philosophoumena, V. 1, 115. [76] Hymn to Demeter, 480-483; Pindar, Fragment 114, ed. Bergk; Sophokles, Fragment 348, ed. Didot; Platon, Phaedon, 13 and 29; Gorgias, 47; Republic, 2, 6; Axiochos, p. 196; Isokrates, Panegyric, 28; Panathenais, p. 185, ed. Jebb; Diodoros of Sicily, 5, 49, 6; Cicero, Laws, 2, 14; Inscription from third century A. D. in Ephemeris Archæologike, 1883, p. 81. [77] Pavsanias, 10, 31, 11. [78] Ploutarch, Morals, 22 a; Diogenes Laertios, 6, 39; Julian, Oration 7, 238. [79] De Vict. offer. 12, p. 261 M. [80] Zosimos, 4, 3.

that whatever was good ought to be promulgated broadcast, and what was bad ought to be exposed.[81]

After the initiation ceremonies were over the plemochoan rites were performed. These seem to have been libations in memory of the dead.[82] Then all prepared to return to Athens, unless, as was the case on fixed years, if not annually, they prolonged their stay for two or three days in order to celebrate a series of athletic and stadiac games.[83] Properly enough, the prizes offered in the contests celebrated here in the territory sacred to the corn goddess Demeter were measures of barley, reaped perhaps in the sacred Rarian plain.[84]

The return to Athens took place in the form of procession, for the god Iakchos had to be escorted back to his sanctuary with becoming pomp. A short distance outside the city of Athens there was a bridge over the Kephisos river, which in the classic days of antiquity was as famous as was the statue of the Pasquino in the days of the Humanists in Rome. The returning mysts and epopts were encountered here by an immense crowd of sportive Athenians, and assailed by all kinds of raillery, jibes and quolibets.[85] The initiated vigorously answered this shower of ribald darts by retorting in kind. Many in the crowd wore masks. Noted public men and their acts were open to the scorchings and criticisms of wit. Coarse vulgarisms could not have been absent.[86] After the battle of "gephyrisms" was over, all proceeded on to the city, where the statue of Iakchos was replaced in the sanctuary, and the rites of Elevsis were finished for that year.

Even after Greece lost her independence and became a Roman province the mysteries continued to flourish. The Romans had accepted Hellenic culture, and were therefore not to be excluded from Elevsis, and great numbers of them took the trouble of being initiated, including several of the emperors.[87] But the sun of paganism began to lose its splendor. Julian, in his attempt to recall the disappearing forms of the past, tried to arouse new enthusiasm for the mysteries. In the year 364 the Christian Emperor Valentinian issued an edict forbidding all nocturnal heathen celebrations, but, yielding to the prayers of the pro-Consul of Achaia, made an exception in favor of the cult of Demeter at Elevsis.[88] But the doomed end was near, for the Great Master of higher mysteries, the Nazarene, had conquered. The house of the Evmolpids, which for a thousand years had controlled the Elevsinian cult and from which the hierophant was always to be chosen, perished heirless. Towards

[81] Loukian, Life of Demonax, 11. [82] Athenaeos, 11, p. 496. [83] C. I. A., II., 341, 402, 444, etc.; Müller, Fragmenta Hist. Graec., II., p. 189, 282; Marmor Parium, 30. [84] Scholion to Pindar, Olympic Ode, 9, 150. [85] Hesychios, s. v. "gephyrismos;" Scholion to Aristophanes Acharnians, 708. [86] Cf. Aristophanes, Frogs, 409-412. [87] E. g., Hadrian; Cf. Spart. Hadr., 13, 1; Evsebios, Chronicles, 2, p. 166, ed. Schöne. [88] Zosimos, 4, 3, p. 176.

the middle of the fourth century the hierophant who initiated the rhetorician Maximus and his biographer Evnapios was indeed an Evmolpid, but he was the last of his line.[89] In the year 394 the Emperor Theodosios the Second ordered the temple at Elevsis to be closed. But, taking advantage of some favorable opportunity, the wrecked but stubborn adherers to the old cult called a Mithras priest from Thespiae and set him up as hierophant in the temple of Demeter.[90] But the usurper's exaltation was brief. In the year 395 Alaric and his army of Visigoths came to Elevsis and completely pillaged it.[91] Earthquakes and all-destroying time and the hands of man have continued the work of desolation. And now Elevsis is merely a hillside overlooked by a mediæval Frankish tower and covered with intricate heaps of ruins which the natives used to carry off as building material for their huts, and where English dilettanti and French savants and Greek archæologists have loved to make researches, and among which the daughters of Illyrian invaders, who dwell near by, step their dances to Albanian music on the feast days of their patron saints.

DANIEL QUINN.

Athens, Greece.

CARDINAL MERMILLOD.

I know not when God will call me to Himself; if it be in Rome, I pray of the R. R. F. F. Carthusians to give me the hospitality of the tomb within their vault at the Campo Verano, should this be not inconvenient to them. If I die near Geneva, I desire to be laid within the vaults of Monthoux, or beside my parents, beneath a plain stone slab bearing the inscription of what I have been, with these words added,

Dilexit Ecclesiam.

"HE loved the Church!" It was, in truth, the very sum and substance of his life who, prince of the Church and confessor of the faith, far-famed preacher and idol of the multitude, champion of the workingmen and beloved of his Pontiff-king, was yet constrained to ask "the hospitality of the tomb" of a humble monastery far removed from the dear land of his birth, while the grand and gracious edifice built by the fruits of his own toil and eloquence within his native city stood empty and desolate and desecrated by the presence of an ignoble schism.

Those of our readers who remember a former paper in this *Review* on "The Restoration of Catholicity in Geneva" may easily recall how, after the great apostasy under Calvin, Geneva had become so

[89] Evnapios, Life of Maximus, p. 52, ed. Boisonnade. [90] Evnapios, Maximus, p. 52. [91] Evnapios, p. 53.

Protestant a city that not only the presence of a priest and the saying of Mass, but even the sale of a cross, a crucifix, a rosary or a Catholic book was forbidden by law within the precincts of the town; and how, later on, for a hundred years or more the chapel of the French Embassy (opened in spite of vehement opposition on the part of the Genevan government) was the sole spot within the town or canton where Mass was allowed to be said.

During the French Revolution Geneva was approached in missionary spirit by many an apostle from the neighboring Catholic cantons and provinces, and became a refuge for numbers of exiled Savoyard priests, who, like the *emigré* ecclesiastics in England, doubtless brought a blessing with them. When persecution was relaxed, with Napoleon's Consulate, the vicars general of Lausanne, who administered Geneva under its absent titular Bishop, essayed to establish a permanent mission there, and at the instance of Catholic France the Grand Council made reluctant cession of an old Catholic church, St. Germain, to the French and other Catholics of the town under their first curé, M. Lacoste. It was only at this time, in 1801, that the titular see of Geneva was finally suppressed, or, rather, merged in that of Chambery, on the publication of the famous Concordat which involved the remodeling of the whole ecclesiastical administration of France. Up to this date the lineal succession of Bishops of Geneva had been faithfully kept up, the holders of this empty title residing for the most part at Annecy, and from there administering the affairs of their diocese. Mgr. Paget, the last of these prelates and a most saintly man, was forced, on the French invasion of Savoy, to retire to Turin, whence he watched over his diocese as best he could and provided a refuge for such of his flock as desired to avail themselves of it, sending from thence in 1795 a touching pastoral, said to recall in its language and spirit that of early Christian times, in which he divided his diocese into twenty-four districts, to be visited in due order by missionaries and lay helpers as occasion served.

When the Church of St. Germain was handed over to the Catholics, in 1803, under the pastoral protection of the Archbishop of Chambery, now their Bishop, the former chief pastor, Mgr. Paget, happened to be staying in Geneva, paying a farewell visit to his little flock, and it was he who, a few days after its restoration to Catholic worship, formally blessed and said Mass therein, his last episcopal act ere retiring to his native town, St. Julien, to die.

Thus the old order of things was linked to the new, and the Church of St. Germain, under its energetic and saintly curé, M. Vuarin, became a very living centre of Genevan Catholicity. At his death, in 1843, Geneva held within its walls some seven thousand Catholics,

schools taught by Christian Brothers and by the Sisters of St. Vincent de Paul, a Catholic hospital and orphanage and other flourishing good works.

It was during the halcyon period of M. Vuarin's long and fruitful pastorate that, on the feast of St. Maurice, Switzerland's chief patron saint, Gaspard, the first child of Jacques Mermillod, a baker of Carouge, and of Pernette, his wife, first saw the light, September 22, 1824. Carouge is a small and quiet suburb of the town of Geneva, and few must have been the Catholic families who gathered there in the bare and humble village chapel, not many years erected probably, for their use. To its font was brought a frail and tiny babe, whose passionately loving mother could scarce keep breath of life in him with all her untiring devotion and still more tireless prayers, little dreaming of the day when he should return to her wrapped in the purple robe of the episcopate.

The boy grew and thrived, always a delicate, precocious, lively and sensitive child, as he began his early studies at the local day school, played with his companions at saying Mass or preaching (principally the latter) and in soberer earnest took part in that service of the altar which has so often proved precursor to the priesthood. His curé noticed the boy's interest in sacred things, his devout attendance at the altar, and urged his parents to let him study Latin, admitting him, too, at an earlier age than was customary to make his first Communion. On entering his fourteenth year he left the paternal roof to become a student at the "mixed" college in Geneva, where he headed the small group of Catholic boys he found there and formed them into a kind of confraternity for converting their Protestant comrades! But he was no sanctimonious or solemn youth, this slender, excitable boy, in spite of his premature propagandism, his childish imitations of priestly functions and his very genuine love of the poor, which sometimes led him even to the questionable lengths of appropriating his father's loaves for their benefit, an act of charity one is sure must have been less condemned than applauded, if not by the sturdy baker himself, at least by his gentle and pious mother, who is said to have been singularly refined both in mind and person, "a born lady," as the saying goes; on the contrary, young Gaspard immortalized his story at one college after another by acquiring a reputation for perpetual high spirits and a great love of boyish pranks and practical jokes of all kinds, of which various instances are still remembered by his comrades.

In 1837 he passed on to more definite theological studies at the Petit Seminaire of St. Louis du Pont, near Chambery, and having finished his "rhetoric" there, went for "philosophy" to the severer Jesuit College at Fribourg. The letters which his affectionate

family received from him at this period breathe a spirit of joyous contentment which told well for his love of learning.

"I would not exchange my little study and my books for all the gold in the world," he writes. "The hours pass quickly, and I am plunged in work up to the eyes: from five in the morning until eight at night all my moments are counted. I have eight professors! So you may judge whether I have leisure to count the flies, or rather to see the snow, for winter is here."

It was the custom in this, as in most seminaries—we say "was," for unhappily since those days the Jesuits have been expelled from Fribourg—for each priestly aspirant to preach a trial sermon before professors and fellow-students, prepared and written out beforehand. Young Mermillod, however, having at the duly appointed time written and committed to memory the *first* part of his discourse, declared, to the consternation of his hearers, that he would deliver the second part extempore and *unprepared.* The little audience settled to listen in some anxiety, but when, after the gracefully rounded and studied periods of the first part, young Mermillod burst forth into a sudden torrent of eloquence, they felt that one of those orators who are "born, not made," stood among them. A later incident, recorded in the unpublished notes on his life, now in the possession of his family, exhibits, under another phase, the dawning of that gracious gift which was to hold thousands spellbound in later years, as well as possessing a peculiar interest for all lovers of that devotion which is our most precious consolation in these evil and lukewarm times. It seems that the chaplain of the convent school of the Sacré Cœur at Montet had engaged a Jesuit preacher for the "Fête du Sacré Cœur" on the 11th of June, 1847. Almost at the last moment he was prevented from fulfilling his engagement, and the chaplain hurriedly sent to Fribourg for a substitute. No other preacher being apparently obtainable, the good fathers sent off young Mermillod, then only a deacon of twenty-two.

Now, on the vigil of the feast day all the girls who were about to receive Holy Communion were talking together about the coming festival, and they agreed among themselves, "were inspired," as the story goes, to unite in earnest prayer, offering their communions of the next morning and other pious acts and sacrifices for the special intention "that God would send to them an apostle of the Sacred Heart." Next day, after their communion, the girls began to describe one to another the "apostle" for whom they had been asking. He was to be eloquent, of course, devoted to the Holy Father, a faithful and devout son of the Church, very zealous against heresy, and then, they all agreed, he was to have *"l'auréole de la souffrance et de la persécution."* What secret promptings of the Divine Heart

may have given birth to this strange girlish wish, who can tell? But that evening, after Vespers, a young, unknown preacher, a mere boy they must have deemed him, mounted, with evident nervousness, the pulpit steps and began a timidly spoken discourse on the subject of the day—the words of our Lord to Blessed Margaret Mary Alacoque. Gradually the youthful speaker seemed to gain courage as he told his hearers that he was not even yet a priest and was preaching that day for the first time; and presently, in an impassioned burst of fervor, he exclaimed: "Seigneur, je m 'engage a consacrer ma vie a procurer la gloire de Votre Cœur adorable. J'en fais le serment, *je serai l'apôtre du Sacré Cœur!*"

Years afterwards Monseigneur Mermillod, preaching in another convent of the same order, referred to this incident with the following remark: "Your companions' prayers were heard even beyond their aspirations, since Pius IX., when consecrating me Bishop, at the time of the beatification of the Venerable Marguerite M. Alacoque, bestowed on me the title of *evêque du Sacré Cœur.*"

The youthful preacher had received the sub-diaconate about two years before the votive incident at the hands of his friend and master, Mgr. Rondu, before the tomb of the great Apostle of Savoy at Annecy, and some days after this impassioned consecration of himself to a like apostolate he received, from his own Bishop, Mgr. Marrilley, the further dignity of the priesthood, "with dispensation of age," on the 24th of June, 1847. His first Mass was said in Geneva on the feast of SS. Peter and Paul, and though we hear nothing of those who assisted at it, one is sure that the devoted mother and proud father and all their little family circle would not have failed to be of its congregation. The young abbé was at once appointed Vicaire of Geneva under M. Marilley's successor, M. Dunoyer, and found himself immediately plunged, not only into parochial, but into controversial work.

For the disastrous civil war called the War of the Sonderbund, which resulted in the expulsion of the Jesuits, the Redemptorists and other religious orders from Fribourg and the rest of the Catholic cantons, was about to open, and after a short but fierce struggle the Catholic army, overpowered by numbers, was forced to capitulate. Convents were suppressed, seminaries closed, priests harassed and persecuted and their venerable chief, the Bishop of Fribourg, was first imprisoned in the historic Castle of Chillon and then exiled.

Probably the ever keen antagonism of the Genevan world to Catholicity in any shape or form was accentuated, if possible, by the consciousness of that struggle beyond. The young curate found ample scope for his controversial tastes and love of fighting in polemical writings and the founding of a religious paper treating of the ques-

tions of the day, *L'Observateur de Genéve*, as well as two later periodicals, the *Annales Catholiques de Genéve* and the *Correspondence de Genéve.*

But an event was now to occur which would carry his name and fame far beyond the boundaries of his native country. Towards the end of 1850 the Genevan Council, priding itself in possession of certain portions of territory where the ancient ramparts of the city had formerly been and were now demolished, presented these lands as building sites to various public bodies, and amongst others a portion was allotted to the Catholics, on which to build a church, that of St. Germain being far too small to contain half their number. It had been the dream of M. Vuarin's life, and now his successor was to carry it out. But though the site was there, the money to build was lacking, and so, remembering the large handed generosity of Catholic France, the Curé of Geneva set out on a begging tour therein, accompanied by his young vicaire.

Their first halt was in Paris, where they met with an encouraging reception, and it so happened that one evening the two Genevese priests were in the reception room of Mgr. Sibour, then Archbishop of Paris, when the venerable Curé of Notre Dame des Victoires and saintly founder of its renowned confraternity, M. Desgenettes, came to lay before his chief an unexpected difficulty which had just befallen him. The Lenten preacher chosen for that office in his church had been suddenly prevented from fulfilling his undertaking; the time was at hand, and M. Desgenettes could find no fitting substitute. Of course, in a church at once so popular and so fashionable, no mediocre preacher would pass muster, and Mgr. Sibour stood reflective for a moment reviewing the situation. Then, with a sudden flash of inspiration, he turned to M. Desgenettes. "Do not distress yourself, M. le Curé," he said; "here is the man who can help you in your need!" And he presented, by a gesture, the young priest by his side, who, almost speechless with surprise, stammered a humble disclaimer as the worthy curé of Notre Dame turned to proffer a formal request for his services. "Do not be afraid," urged the saintly priest gently, "the Blessed Virgin will assist you!" After much hesitation he yielded to the persuasion of his superiors, and finally that time-honored shrine, with its miraculous statue, its ex-voto hung walls, its air heavy with a million prayers, a thousand heartfelt thanksgivings, saw our youthful *debutant* entering his public career in the pulpit of Notre Dame des Victoires.

"From that time," writes one of his biographers, "there was no more peace or repose for the Abbé Mermillod;" his fate was decided; he was to be a popular preacher. Possessing to an exceptional extent the three great qualities of a preacher, clearness of thought,

ready command of language and above all that indescribable "unction" which appeals to heart and brain alike with its subtle, intangible charm, its burning words, its inner and consuming fire, Gaspard Mermillod found himself, from the hour of his first success, launched on one unending round of sermons, Lents, missions and retreats. Paris called him again and again to her pulpits, side by side with Lacordaire and Ravignan and all the great names of the day. Turin saw him preaching before Victor Emmanuel and his Piedmontese Court in 1852; Marseilles, Rouen, Toulouse, Dijon, Bordeaux, all the great cities of France welcomed him north and south, till, like another great contemporary preacher, Father Hermann, the Carmelite, he might have answered when questioned as to his place of residence: "Madame, I live . . . on the train!" Soon he was called on to give ecclesiastical retreats, a branch of priestly labor which soon became one of his specialties, and when, on account of a delicate throat, he was ordered to winter in Rome, Cardinals, Ambassadors and a host of other distinguished personages swelled the ranks of his auditors and admirers.

Meanwhile the walls of a graceful Gothic building, "the most correct and most finished work of our century," were slowly rising, paid for by the results of his eloquence, on the site of the wall originally raised by the King of Prussia to defend Protestant Geneva against Catholic Savoy!

The church was completed in 1857 and consecrated ceremonially on Rosary Sunday, in the presence of a brilliant congregation, Queen Christina of Spain, the Duc and Duchesse de Montpensier, the Abbot of the great African monastery at Staönch, Dom François Régis, and some four thousand others, representing the Catholic world in various countries, even as the building itself, raised by the alms and subscriptions of all nations, represented and belonged to all. The Abbé Mermillod preached the opening sermon, and it was a strange and a striking one, having as its title the words, "Notre Dame is an act of liberty and of nationality."

He was named its first rector, M. Dunoyer continuing to hold the post of "curé of Geneva," and for some years afterwards his life was an uneventful one, passed partly in pastoral and parochial labors and partly in responding to the numerous invitations which besieged him to preach in France and elsewhere. Among the more famous of these sermons is one which should specially touch all English-speaking peoples. It was the famine year of 1862, which devastated all Ireland with its ravages, and the young preacher, whose heart vibrated with sympathy for every distress, whether moral or physical, ascended the pulpit of Ste. Clotilde, in Paris, to plead for the hunger stricken Irish. He gave as his text the words:

"I have compassion on the multitude because they have now been with me three days, and have nothing to eat." And, enlarging on these familiar words, he drew a thrilling picture of the poverty, the hunger, the ghastly distress of the peasantry, with the additional horror, so familiar to us now, that "fourteen Protestant societies expended their annual millions in tempting to apostasy the unhappy people who cried for bread. Let me proclaim aloud," he cried, in irrepressible indignation, "I declare here, before the holy altar, before this vast assembly, in the sight of God and of His angels, that if ever, I do not say a Pontiff or a priest, but even a simple layman, should attempt that ignoble propaganda which makes of the rich man a religious speculator on the misery of the poor, if ever a Catholic dared to enter the dwelling of a poor man and tempt his soul by such vile means, let his name be forever tarnished in face of the Faith, in the face of honor and before the public conscience. The priest who should protect such efforts would dishonor his priesthood forever, for the Church, that holy guardian of the liberty of souls, forbids such spiritual traffic and protests against this buying and selling of conscience."

The collection which followed this discourse was a scene never to be forgotten by those who witnessed it. Ladies stripped themselves of their bracelets, rings, jewels; men emptied their purses. One poor workman was heard to say as he threw his watch into the collecting plate: "One does not need to know the time when a nation is dying of hunger!" And a young student, amongst others, came into the sacristy, trembling with emotion, and handed to the preacher *the whole of his worldly goods*, consisting of the sum of forty francs, a touching homage to that land "whose pure and ardent patriotism," in the preacher's words, "is guarded by her women and blessed by her priests!"

Seldom, indeed, was the young preacher's tongue more eloquent, his words so powerful as when he touched upon the subject of patriotism.

"Never forget," he cried to the exiled children of Poland on another occasion, "that you are awaiting another Jeanne d'Arc. Only your Jeanne d'Arc, your deliverer—you know who she is to be! No other than the Catholic Church!"

The frequent visits of the Abbé Mermillod to the Eternal City had resulted in his being not only well known to, but *persona grata* to the venerable Head of the Church; but nothing could have been less anticipated than the imperious summons which, in the month of September, 1864, called him to the feet of Pius IX., there to learn, from the Pontiff's own lips, that he had resolved to consecrate him a Bishop. This the Holy Father proceeded to do with his own hands,

on the 24th of the same month, delivering a touching little allocution to the newly ordained Bishop and three others who had recently been invested with the same dignity, while tears of emotion gathered in his mild blue eyes and rolled down his withered cheeks as he exhorted his new-made brother to "go and gain for me that Geneva which dares to call itself the Protestant Rome; bless those peoples who may be ungrateful, but who are my children. Sustain, console the great Catholic family, and convert those whom heresy keeps back from the fold of Christ." His preconization was thus worded:

"For the episcopal see of Hebron, *in partibus infidelium*, the Reverend Gaspard Mermillod, of the Diocese of Geneva, named auxiliary, with residence at Geneva, of His Grace Mgr. Marilley, Bishop of Lausanne and Geneva."

Some days later, when he went to take leave of his beloved Pontiff and friend ere returning to his new diocese, he could not refrain from expressing to that august confidant some of those fears for the future which necessarily suggested themselves even to so sanguine a mind as that of the young Bishop who was going back to face the outpoured hatred of a city whose very foundations were set in bitterest, most bigoted, most virulent persecution. The Pope told him not to fear, but to remember that the Holy Ghost guides the Church, and that his appointment was the work of the Holy Spirit through the Sovereign Pontiff.

So he returned—Bishop of Hebron in name, of Geneva in reality, to the place of his birth. His first episcopal act had been a telegram conveying his blessing to the clergy and people of Geneva; his first act on alighting within Swiss territory, to meet and receive the congratulations of his parents, his mother's greeting being: "Now, my son, I have but one more grace to ask of God for thee, that He would keep thee in humility." Then came the solemn entry into his beautiful Notre Dame, where Catholic and Protestant forgot for a moment their mutual antagonism to kneel side by side for his benediction, while the priest who had baptized him, just forty years before, hung round his neck a handsome pectoral cross.

It was soon found that the episcopal purple brought little change to the kindly, simple, self-sacrificing life of the former humble Swiss curé. The new "Bishop of Geneva" (for such, in truth, was and was well understood to be the so-called Bishop of Hebron) might have vied with his great predecessor, St. Francis of Sales, in the simplicity of his lodging as well as in the almost reckless generosity of his never failing alms. We interview-loving readers of to-day must needs know how his simple study held none but the barest necessities—a writing bureau, a set of bookshelves, a priedieu and crucifix, a few chairs and fewer pictures, the only non-religious one among them

being his mother's portrait, while the still humbler bedroom beyond contained the poorest and narrowest of iron bedsteads, curtained in rough serge, with the benitier surmounted by its bit of blessed palm and simple crucifix at its head.

His way of life was as simple as its setting. At six in the morning he rose and went down to his private chapel, where almost daily a group of penitents awaited his coming, and not until his confessional duties had been discharged did he say his daily Mass, as though he had been still a parish priest. After his thanksgiving he would take a cup of tea and then repair at once to his study, where the unfailing pile of letters and an often irksome succession of visitors filled the morning hours. All who came, all who wrote, men of business, religious disputants, souls in need, beggars of every degree, each received his utmost, his most kindly attention. Sometimes pacing to and fro within the narrow limits of his room, striving to prepare some important discourse or dictating rapidly letter after letter to his secretary and interrupted perhaps twenty times in the course of a morning, now by some rich idler in search of amusement, or half envious working man, comrade of former college days; his house was open to all. One *grande dame*, calling upon "the celebrated preacher" to beguile with his gentle presence some idle half hour, left in his hand at parting a twenty franc piece, in clumsy or haughty acknowledgment of her encroachment, and "Oh," said the long-suffering Bishop as he returned to his interrupted work, "I *did* feel inclined to say to her, 'Take back your money and return to me my wasted time!' "

Again, too, as before, his sermons, missions, retreats continued from one place to another. Again and again his voice was heard, before fashionable Parisian congregations or at still larger gatherings elsewhere, on some one of the burning questions of the day, notably that one, "la question ouvriére" as it was termed, which was only then beginning to be a prominent part of Christian ethics. His voice rang out with no uncertain sound as he told a vast assembly how "in crowning him (St. Joseph) it is Christian democracy which is crowned, it is the glorification of Labor."

Again he was urgent on the necessity for the Church's showing herself to be in the vanguard of progress, accepting and welcoming all modern inventions, all scientific discoveries: "Plus que personne nous devons saisir des forces sociales modernes, de l'electricité, des chemins de fer, pour préparer l'avenement du regne de Jésus Christ, de ce regne ou il n'y aura qu'un seul troupeau et un seul pasteur." And with this thought, when he was requested by the P. L. M. Railway Company to bless their new station at Geneva (for by a curious legalism the railway station at Geneva is French and not

Swiss territory), he caused a special "thanksgiving" service to be performed at his own beautiful Church of Notre Dame, and preached himself on "How the Church is the friend of modern progress in the domain of letters, arts and industries."

When the Vatican Council assembled, in 1869, the Holy Father summoned Monseigneurs Mermillod and Manning to his presence together, and in his own gracious way told them of his joy in welcoming the pastors of "the two dioceses which had not been represented at the Council of Trent, London and Geneva." And during his sojourn in the Eternal City the Bishop of Hebron, "thanks to his astounding activity, which enabled him to be everywhere and at everything at once," as Louis Veuillot wrote of him, "was occupied as incessantly as ever in preaching at one church after another."

On the 18th of July, 1870, the doctrine of Papal infallibility was solemnly proclaimed by Pius IX. in council, and on the following day war was declared between France and Germany. Two months later Rome was in the hands of the Piedmontese, the Pope a prisoner in the Vatican and the members of the interrupted Council scattered far and wide, returning to their own dioceses. The "Bishop of Hebron" on his return lost no time in announcing from the pulpit the newly defined dogma; but the displeasure of the Genevan Government at this (as they deemed it) daring action was momentarily set aside by the more immediately pressing political events which absorbed all thoughts. Bourbaki's fugitive army, 80,000 strong, had crossed the border and taken refuge in Switzerland, where, billeted here and there in the different cantons, their destitute and suffering condition appealed not unsuccessfully to the pity of their Swiss hosts. Monseigneur Mermillod was foremost in the many good works set on foot in aid of the wounded or famine-stricken soldiers, and his love of the poor, his ever open hand and generous heart were taxed to the uttermost on their behalf.

But when political matters became less stormy without, a blacker cloud arose upon the horizon at home. A certain M. Carteret, a fanatical Protestant, took advantage of his appointment to a prominent post in the government to declare open war against Catholicism, and his first step was to procure the banishment of the humble Christian Brothers, who ever since M. Vuarin's time had lived and worked in the city. Their Bishop flew to defend them and poured forth an indignant protest from the pulpit on the 11th of August, 1872. It was not the first time he had opposed M. Carteret, who bitterly disliked him, and the answer of his opponent came swiftly. On the 30th of the same month a decree of the Council of State enjoined on Mgr. Mermillod to "abstain from any act which he might perform as vicar general or bishop's delegate."

Mgr. Mermillod replied "that he would submit the matter to his ecclesiastical superiors."

Six days afterwards he was summoned to appear in person before the Council and to give an answer, in its presence, to the following question:

"Does Monsieur Mermillod, the curé of Geneva, intend to conform, from the present moment, to the prescriptions of the Council of State contained in its letter of the 30th of August?"

Without a moment's hesitation Mgr. Mermillod dictated his reply to the Chancellor of the Council:

"Monseigneur Mermillod does not recognize the competence of the Council of State in a question of spiritual administration, ... he therefore cannot relinquish his spiritual functions until the spiritual authority which confided them to him takes them back. Never, since 1815, have vicars general been either accepted or suspended by any Council of State. Consequently Mgr. Mermillod cannot yield to the orders and the threats of the Council of State to cease exercising the functions of Auxiliary Bishop and vicar general; it is a case of duty, of inviolable fidelity to the rights of the Church, which are compatible with devotion to his country.

(Signed) "GASPARD MERMILLOD,
"Bishop of Hebron."

"Well," cried M. Carteret bitterly as they stood face to face, "it is a case of war between us two. We shall see who will gain the victory!"

The Bishop retired, calm and unmoved, and the Council continued its debate, Carteret exclaiming excitedly:

"We must draw up an article preventing Monsieur Mermillod from being curé any more. Courage, gentlemen; *no half measures!*"

On which a fellow-Councillor gravely commented:

"I confess I feel very little courage when it is a question of laying hands upon the conscience of my neighbor."

But Carteret's more violent counsels prevailed, and on the 20th of the same month (September) two decrees were issued by the government which enacted that "Monsieur" Mermillod thereby ceased to be recognized as curé of Geneva, was forbidden to exercise any ecclesiastical function, and his stipend was withdrawn. A storm of indignation burst from his people and from the whole Catholic world when these decrees were made public. Addresses of sympathy or more energetic remonstrances poured in on all sides. The well-known Catholic champion, Louis Veuillot, immediately opened a subscription list in the pages of the *Univers* to supply for the withheld stipend of the Genevese "curé," which in the course of a few days amounted to 25,000 francs and was closed by a Papal donation of 2,000 francs.

Monseigneur Marilley, the Bishop of Lausanne and Geneva, whose "suffragan" Mgr. Mermillod in reality was, now formally resigned his sway over the Genevan portion of his diocese, which

thus lapsed to the direct authority of Rome, and the Pope, finding negotiation useless, appointed as vicar general of Geneva direct from himself, by special brief, Monseigneur Mermillod! The brief was dated January 16, 1873.

On receiving from the Papal Nuncio at Berne the brief in question, which was officially communicated also to the Council of State, Mgr. Mermillod notified its contents to the faithful in a circular which was read in all the pulpits of the canton on Sunday, February 2, and that same evening Carteret convoked a special meeting of the Council, at which he proposed to seize Mgr. Mermillod and put him in prison.

His proposition was rejected, but another carried, in which the Council summoned the recalcitrant Bishop to declare "within twenty-four hours, before midday on Saturday," whether he would persist in fulfilling the functions of Vicar Apostolic, or renounce them according to the injunctions already served on him by the cantonal and federal authorities.

The Bishop replied within the prescribed period in a document of some length, stating that he "must remain faithful to the eternal principle, 'Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's.'"

He himself expected the answer to this statement to be immediate imprisonment, and begged his flock, should this take place, to "believe no false reports" as to his having swerved from this position. On the following day, Sunday, he preached as usual at Notre Dame, referring to the question of the hour in his usual half genial, half sarcastic way, with "The Genevans would die of ennui if they had not the interests of the Catholics to discuss;" and the next day, Monday, as he sat reading his morning paper as usual, he came to the words: "The Federal Council of Switzerland has just passed a decree banishing Mgr. Mermillod from Swiss territory."

He took up his pen to write a telegram contradicing the report, but while he was in the act of writing it his servant rushed into the room with tears in his eyes, and behind him—a police officer.

"This time, Monseigneur, you must prepare to leave. I have orders to arrest you. Here is the warrant."

"Very well, I accept it," replied the Bishop, holding out his hand for the document. "It will be my passport to heaven!"

He passed into the next room, followed by the police officer, and there, surrounded by his priests, he dictated to his secretary an energetic protest against his illegal arrest. Then, after paying a last visit to the church and praying for a few moments before the Blessed Sacrament, he stepped into the carriage which awaited him, escorted by a body of police, who conveyed him across the frontier

and left him on French territory, close to the little village of Ferney. "Well," said the illustrious exile with a flash of his old gaiety, "here is Calvin sending me to Voltaire! How are they going to agree together?" And he walked on to the humble village presbytery and asked shelter of its curé.

Hardly had the exiled Bishop left his native soil before the gist of M. Carteret's manœuvres became apparent; for only two days later the Genevese Grand Council (an assembly, be it remembered, composed exclusively of Protestants and free thinkers) voted "the reorganization of the Catholic Church."

The series of articles which they proceeded to draw up are too long to be inserted here, but their aim was, in brief, to reduce Catholicism in Geneva to a State Church somewhat on the lines of "Anglicanism" in England; and they were deluded enough to believe that a large percentage, at least, of the Catholic clergy would embrace their proposals, Carteret himself having the effrontery to exclaim with an expressive gesture in the Council chamber: "Cut the cords of the purse and you will see how the clergy will yield to a compromise!" The would-be reformers, however, had the mortification of finding not only that every single Catholic priest in the canton rejected their proposals with scorn, but even Protestants and infidels (Ernest Rénan among them) loudly condemned their attempt.

The modest little village of Ferney now became a centre for pilgrimages, visits, processions, deputations from all parts. One incessant stream of friends, admirers, indignant supporters flocked there to lay their homage at the exile's feet, and he was soon obliged to hire a small house, formerly occupied by Voltaire's niece and immediately opposite to the Château Voltaire, in which to receive his numerous visitors.

Meanwhile the Genevan Government, irritated by their non-success, set to work in earnest. They seized one after another the churches and chapels of the canton, ejecting priests from their presbyteries and banishing such as were not of Swiss nationality. They sent to M. Loyson, the unfrocked Carmelite, inviting him to come and give a series of conferences in Geneva, *to teach "Old Catholicism."* And he went. Then various suspended or otherwise "irregular" priests, tempted by the "loaves and fishes" held out to them, flocked in to fill the places of the expelled Catholic priests, ministering to miscellaneous flocks of malcontents and unbelievers who flaunted their false liberty and license in public journals and assemblies. M. Loyson and two of his associates were "elected" to the "triple curé" of Geneva, this curious arrangement being explained as "lest one curé alone should have too much power," and many disgraceful scenes took place.

A howling mob, with a police officer at its head, broke open the doors of the Church of St. Germain, flooded the sanctuary, refused permission to the curé even to carry away the Blessed Sacrament until the Council of State, appealed to, authorized the action, and Loyson was installed there. Next morning the same turbulent crowd attacked Notre Dame and surged impotently between church and presbytery all day long until dispersed by the police and the firemen with a jet of water from a fire engine! For Notre Dame could hardly be ceded so lightly, even by the high-handed Genevese Government. It was indisputably private property—the property of the Catholics of all nations, whose money had built it—while the site was a gift from the town to "the Catholics of Geneva." So, when the rumor went abroad that it was to be ceded to the schismatics, a cry of indignation went up from the Catholics in all countries, who *claimed their own*, from Pope Pius IX. himself to the representatives of the English subscribers, Lords Denbigh and Gainsborough. So many that the printed report of these protests alone fills a volume of ninety-two pages.

But all was in vain. The Genevan Government, while not daring openly to seize Notre Dame, gave secret encouragement to a so-called "Protestant Commission" to do so; and very early one morning, while the priests in the neighboring presbytery were still asleep, a little band of robbers—a juge de paix, a locksmith and some police officers—stole up to the great door and forced the lock, afterwards affixing the government seals. While they were at work the priests rose as usual and perceived what was going on. They rushed to the doors in a vain attempt to defend their beloved church, and M. Lany, one of the curates, with his brother priests, fought his way in through the mocking, struggling crowd, seized the ciborium which held the Blessed Sacrament and carried it in safety to a convent near, while the venerable rector, M. Dunoyer, was being dragged down the steps by the gendarmes, amid the applause of a handful of Protestants who shouted "á l'eau! á l'eau," their old savage cry. The white-haired successor of M. Vuarin, thus doubly insulted and bereaved, never recovered, either physically or mentally, from the shock, and sank into a premature grave.

The summer of 1873 passed in one long round of pastoral duties as before, for the Bishop's exile had but increased his ever-abundant labors a hundred fold. Without once infringing on Swiss territory he passed from village to village, from town to town, preaching, visiting, holding confirmations, everywhere welcomed with open arms, with tears of affection, with garlanded paths and triumphal arches, till the passage of the exiled and insulted vicar general became one long triumphal march. His enemies within the city were

furious and tried to force the French Government to banish him in their turn; but this much was not conceded to their hatred, and they were forced to be unwilling witnesses of a triumph as genuine as it was unexpected. They contrived, however, to continue their persecutions. The ninety-seven curés of the Bernese Jura, part of the formerly French and newly annexed territory within his diocese, having declared in writing that they remained faithful to their Bishop, were immediately suspended from their posts and exiled from Switzerland, in defiance of the "Act of Union" of 1815, in which the Swiss Government, taking over this portion of French territory, promised entire freedom in religion to their new Catholic subjects.

Exiled and penniless, these ninety-seven confessors took refuge within the French frontier, and there, suffering but steadfast, they watched over their flocks from afar. "They are there, sad but unconquerable," wrote a passer-by some time later of the little band of exiled priests. "They were ninety-seven at the beginning, and now, after two years and a half, not one has deserted." From time to time they crossed the frontier in disguise by night to minister to their bereaved flocks. They visited the sick, they heard confessions, they said Mass in secret, in some loft or cellar, and disappeared again as silently as they had come; while their Bishop, on whom the onus of their support necessarily fell, was working his hardest at the erection and maintenance of various chapels and missions in other parts of his diocese.

In Geneva itself every convent, hospital, orphanage and other good work was swept away, and as one contemporary writer remarks, "in bygone times Calvinist intolerance tried to send the French resident to Mass across the frontier; to-day, being unable to proscribe the Mass, it proscribes charity and sends the orphans, the sick and the poor *across the frontier*."

A fortunate chance enabled the Catholic body to buy a "Masonic Temple," no other than the one built on a companion site (of former city walls) to the Church of Notre Dame, and the congregation of St. Germain migrated thither when consecrated under the title of "L'Eglise du Sacré Cœur." A second chapel, that of Notre Dame des Paquis,* received the dispersed congregation of Notre Dame; that of St. François de Paul rose in another quarter, and the most crowded parish church of all, that of St. Joseph, was bought back by a generous layman and is at present the only original parish church in Geneva restored to Catholic worship.

During the ten years of his exile Mgr. Mermillod saw no less than thirty new churches and chapels erected within his persecuted and

* The Empress of Austria was assassinated close to this chapel, and one of its *vicaires* gave her the last rites of the Church, on September 10, 1898.

dispossessed diocese. The expenses of their erection and maintenance rested, as usual, upon his shoulders, and again he took up his pilgrim staff and went from church to church and from town to town, preaching and pleading for his orphaned people. We are told that more than a hundred thousand francs were annually spent upon this work, gathered almost entirely from France and Belgium, as the fruits of his preaching in these countries. With redoubled activity he had journeyed hither and thither, preaching sometimes as much as five and six times in one day; while to the pitying spectators who noted his labored breath, his swollen throat and aching breast, and begged him to take some period of repose, he announced only: "I shall have Eternity to rest in!"

Ten years passed thus, and then a new and unexpected turn of events took the wondering world by surprise. The Bishop of Lausanne, Mgr. Cosandez, died in 1882, and it rested with the Holy See, as usual, to name his successor. For some five months the see remained vacant; and then, one evening—it was the 14th of March, 1883—Leo XIII. sent for Mgr. Mermillod, who was in Rome, and told him how, after five long months of prayer and examination of the question, he, the mouthpiece of the Holy Ghost, had "of his own personal initiative, resolution and decision," determined to name the exiled Bishop of Hebron to the vacant see.

"My heart full of emotion and my eyes of tears, I could only answer: 'The will of the Pope is the will of God!'" wrote Mgr. Mermillod to his Genevan brethren next day. "All that I am is at your service henceforth—my powers, my devotion, my life."

The preconization of the new Bishop took place on the following day, March 15, in a public consistory at the Vatican, and the news, flashed to Fribourg and all over Switzerland with brief delay, awoke a great thrill of joy within that pious and convent crowded city, "the little Rome," as its inhabitants still love to call it; while the Federal Council, glad, no doubt, to put an end to the unseemly and strained situation of so many years past, revoked on its side the decree of exile and prepared to receive the new-old Bishop of Fribourg-Lausanne—and Geneva.

His arrival in Fribourg was welcomed with the greatest rejoicings, with garlanded streets and festive decorations, while on his part no word of triumph or any reference to his long exile was heard. He seemed to come among them overflowing with love, with tenderness, with the most exquisite charity towards all, even as he had written to them from Rome in announcing his arrival, "count on my heart, as I on my side crave to feel myself loved by you."

He threw himself heart and soul into his episcopal work, preached occasionally outside his own diocese and took part in every pious

work or pilgrimage which asked his presence. In 1889 his grateful people insisted on celebrating with great pomp his "silver jubilee" to the episcopate, and although his humility yearned to commemorate it in silence, he yielded to their wishes, and a splendid "function" and series of fêtes crowned the close of his twenty-five years of episcopal life.

Not long after this undesired but well merited triumph he was obliged by failing health to leave for a time the scene of his labors and to pass the winter of 1889-90 in Cannes and Rome. Here he occupied himself in the interests of his diocese, especially in one project which lay very near his heart, the establishment of a Catholic University in Fribourg; and when the balmy month of May seemed to give promise of speedy return to his northern home he presented himself before the Pope in what he believed to be an audience of farewell. But the Pontiff who had summoned him greeted him with these words: "This is not a visit of farewell! You are to remain here in Rome until the next consistory; for my will is to create you Cardinal. It is a legitimate recompense, for you have worked and suffered much for the Church." His hearer, surprised and much moved, found voice to reply with, "Holy Father, to work and to suffer for the Church is in itself the greatest honor and the highest recompense that God can deign to give to a man called to such mission." "That is true," answered Leo XIII., "but the Church must also be just and grateful; that is why I wish to make you a Cardinal. It is I myself who have chosen you, without any human intervention. I have it at heart to show my affection for Switzerland, as I have already done for England and the United States."

So, on the 25th of June, in the Vatican, Monseigneur Mermillod received the Cardinal's hat from the hands of the Supreme Pontiff himself, with the words: "The whole world knows the trials, the lengthened labors, the exile you have endured to serve the cause of the Church and of its Head. All men know, too, your indefatigable zeal for the faith and for the salvation of souls, as well as the efficacy of your words for enlightening intelligences and drawing hearts to God. But if the Cardinalate be a recompense for services rendered and a stimulant towards rendering more, we will also that it should be a fresh proof of our consideration and of our special regard for that Switzerland whose son you are."

A series of fêtes and ovations followed, with the stately ceremony of installation in his titular Basilica, that of SS. Nereus and Achilleus, and his return to Switzerland was one long triumphal procession. The remainder of that summer—after a short sojourn in Fribourg—he passed, in but indifferent health, in a little property of his own near Geneva called the Château de Monthoux.

Then, what was in all truth another cross, and not a light one, though scarcely suspected at the time, came upon him. The Holy Father summoned him again to Rome and signified his wish that the new Cardinal should take up his abode there and—as a necessary consequence—resign the See of Fribourg.

Probably his own failing health would soon have rendered this step necessary, but none the less it came upon him as a blow. His passionate patriotism, innate in almost every Swiss heart, and specially prominent in his, made any other country than his own, even Rome, a land of exile; and the grief he felt at being again separated from the land of his birth grew into a long drawn agony which ceased but with his life. "C'est le Cardinalat qui l'a tué," said one of his intimate friends to the present writer; and little as it was guessed at the time, there is little doubt now that it was so. In obedience to the wish of the Pope he resigned his see and consecrated with his own hands his successor, Mgr. Deruaz, in the Canadian Chapel at Rome, on the 19th of March, 1891.

The following summer he passed at Monthoux, the internal malady which consumed him making rapid progress, and then, as it was hoped that the mild air of Rome might retard his end, he was brought back there by slow and easy stages, and lingered for some months until, in the month of February, an attack of influenza supervened and his strength failed rapidly. As he lay dying, surrounded by relatives and friends, he showed the same gracious, kindly sweetness of word and demeanor which had ever characterized him. The watchers who knelt by his bedside would receive from his trembling hand not one, but five or six "signes de croix" upon their foreheads when voice had failed; for "in death, as in life, he was never tired of giving benedictions." While life was ebbing his secretary came from the Vatican bearing the last Papal Benediction to his dying master, who lifted the hand of the welcome messenger to his lips in token of grateful recognition, and not long afterwards sank gradually into unconsciousness and breathed his last on February 23, 1892.

Eleven Cardinals in full state and vast crowds of clergy and people followed the simple coffin "without flowers or state," according to his expressed desire, to the Carthusian vault within the same stately basilica where Pius IX., his friend and father, lay, and "He will have a great reward," spoke Leo XIII. to his sorrowing family as they knelt before him some days later. "He was looked upon by every one as an apostle and a saint."

. . . . . .

"Monseigneur Mermillod," says a recent writer in one of the French reviews, "is assuredly one of the most sympathetic figures

of the second half of the nineteenth century. A marvelous gift of eloquence and a charming amenity of manner were added in his person to every priestly virtue. The charm of his manner was but equaled by the dignity of his life and the ardor of his zeal and charity. Very popular in the highest society, he was especially the friend of the humble and the obscure, and was one of the first to dare to preach before the rich and the powerful in support of the claims of the working classes. His enemies accused him of ambition and social intrigue. His ambition was—to bring back his country to its ancient faith, to reconcile his beloved Geneva with Rome. He proved that he had no other ambition by refusing the flattering advances made to him by the French Government, which offered him successively the Bishopric of Nice and the Archbishopric of Chambery. As to his politics, his former fellow-workers, those who were the best fitted to know him intimately, declared that he had none. With his delicate minded and generous nature, all sentiment and confiding goodness, he could never divine in others a maliciousness of which he felt himself to be incapable. His great mistake was never to have doubted the loyalty of his enemies, and his great illusion, to believe that the republican and democratic institutions of his country, for which he had a perfect enthusiasm, were a sort of inviolable palladium for the Catholic apostolate."

T. L. L. TEELING.

London.

THE TEMPORAL POWER.

FOR Catholics the momentous question of the day, religious and quasi-political, is that of the Pope's Temporal Power. Nor does it concern Catholics alone, but the whole world. For, indirectly, the whole world—Catholic and non-Catholic, Christian and non-Christian—is interested in its settlement; first on grounds of abstract justice, to see that a great wrong is righted; secondly, because on its due solution the tranquillity and contentment of the world, to some extent, depend. As long as the Roman Pontiff remains a prisoner in his own city, practically under the lock and key of a usurper, so long will this politico-religious difficulty remain an open sore and so long will two hundred million Catholics, scattered throughout the world, be restless and unwilling to accept the *status quo*. Directly, however, the question affects the Christian nations alone, for they alone by baptism are subjects of the Church.

Moreover, in practice, it concerns Catholics only. Its bearing on Protestants is chiefly of a speculative character, since far from admitting the Pope's jurisdiction over them, they emphatically deny it. At the lowest they are indifferent, and in the main they are hostile. Indeed, had it not been for the moral and material support of Protestants in general, and of British Protestants in particular, the revolutionary Italians in 1870 could not have accomplished this crying act of injustice—the usurpation and spoliation of Rome.

Nine times before has Rome been captured by the enemies of the Papacy, and nine times was the peace of Europe disturbed. Moreover, that peace was never once restored except by the restoration of the Temporal Power.

Taking stock of the confronting forces on this great battlefield of religion and politics, we find ranged, on one side the compact army of sound and well-informed Catholics, and on the other side a motley array of infidels, revolutionists, communists, most non-Catholic Christians, many liberal—that is, unsound—Catholics and lastly not a few Catholics who err, not from malice, but from inculpable ignorance. These last are ignorant for want of due instruction on this vital question. That such ignorance exists probably no one would care to deny. Differences of opinion in matters of minor detail are legitimate enough, but it is surely a curious sign of the times to find Catholics—and sometimes Catholics who ought to know better—professing the laxest views on this all-important question.

I propose in this article to set forth, as far as I understand them, our obligations in regard to the Temporal Power, and the grounds of those obligations. However, before entering on the specific topic of the Pope's Civil Princedom, there are some preliminary questions which I intend to touch on by way of clearing the ground. This seems all the more necessary, since the most exaggerated views have at times been current as to what the Holy Father's temporal powers really are—as to their nature, their limits and their necessity. On the one hand the extravagant opinion has been propounded by some theologians—Henry of Segusia, Augustinus Triumphus, Alvarus Pelagius—that the Pope's direct temporal power is coextensive with the earth.[1] More unbalanced still in their opinions, some few—Hostiensis, for example[2]—have taught that by Christ's coming all heathen lands were confiscated to the Pope, and that he, consequently, could assign them to whomsoever he chose. On the other hand, Calvin, Peter Martyr and others defended the heretical opinion that the Roman Pontiff, as such, was *de jure divino* debarred from all

[1] This opinion is emphatically denied by Bellarmine, "Tertia Controversia Generalis;" "De Rom. Pontif," v., 1; cf. Hergenröther, "The Catholic Church and the Christian State"—Essay 13, part 2, sec. 3. [2] Bellarmine l. c.

temporal powers and possessions and that for him to bear a temporal sword was a hall-mark of Anti-Christ.

I begin then by laying down four introductory propositions which I will number for the sake of clearness.

The first proposition is this, that in no sense whatever has the Roman Pontiff direct temporal jurisdiction over the whole world. He has, indeed, jurisdiction, temporal but indirect, over all Christians scattered over the whole world; but nothing more. What, however, is meant by direct and indirect jurisdiction? The two terms play an important part in this discussion, and therefore call for clear definition. By *direct* temporal jurisdiction I mean that which is exercised primarily for the advancement of temporal interests; by *indirect*, that which is exercised for the furtherance primarily of spiritual and only secondarily of temporal interests. That the Pope has no spiritual or temporal, direct or indirect, jurisdiction over the whole world is obvious from the fact that Christ gave him none. Our Lord's command to "go and teach all nations" gave only the right to preach and conferred no jurisdiction over all.

The second proposition is this, that the Pope has no direct temporal authority even over the Christian world. Direct spiritual authority he has, conferred by the words, "Feed My sheep, feed My lambs." But neither Scripture nor Apostolic Tradition shows any trace of any such direct temporal jurisdiction. When to Peter and his successors Christ gave "the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven," that gift carried with it direct spiritual, but not direct temporal, authority over Christendom. Were it otherwise, an infidel king, by conversion to Christianity, would forfeit his throne to the Pope—which is absurd. Therefore it is that the Church says in the Vespers of the Epiphany:

> Crudelis Herodes, Deum
> Regem venire quid times?
> Non eripit mortalia,
> Qui regna dat coelestia.

The third proposition is this, that the Roman Pontiff has temporal power, supreme but indirect, not over the whole world, but over all Christendom. Not over the whole world; for the direct spiritual and the indirect temporal powers are coextensive, and as the former does not embrace the whole world, so neither does the latter. But over all Christendom; for as that is the extension of the spiritual power, so also must it be the extension of the temporal. For the indirect temporal is but an aspect of the spiritual power, and was given concomitantly with the spiritual.

It is essential to notice that this indirect temporal power is temporal but in name and is spiritual in reality. It concerns the temporal aspect of spiritual things and the spiritual aspect of temporal

things. Hergenröther,[3] in an admirable essay on this subject, writes: "This indirect power of the Church in matters temporal . . . is not a temporal, but a spiritual power. It is exerted in matters temporal only in so far as they trench upon religion and thus cease to be purely temporal."

It follows then that within certain due and well defined limits the civil is subordinate to the spiritual power. And reasonably so, since the end of the former is temporal and mediate, that of the latter spiritual and final. The one promotes temporal interests, the other eternal salvation. Nevertheless both Church and State have their own clearly defined spheres into which the other has no right to intrude. Hence St. Bernard wrote: "When temporal rulers make no opposition to the divine law, they then hold their kingdoms and their rights entire and with full power."[4] Both these spheres are, however, concentric and the radius of the ecclesiastical sphere is greater than the radius of the civil sphere, so that while the State has no power outside her own circumference, the Church has direct spiritual power throughout her whole circumference and indirect temporal power within the circumference of the State. However, this leaves the State absolute mistress within her own proper domain. If, for example, the State cannot define doctrines, so neither may the Church command conscription. Therefore St. Thomas writes:[5] "The secular power is under the spiritual power in so far as it is placed under it by God; that is to say, in those things that concern the salvation of souls. Consequently therein we must obey the spiritual rather than the temporal authority. But, in what belongs to the civil sphere, we must obey the temporal rather than the spiritual authority, according to those words, 'Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, but unto God the things that are God's.'" This indirect temporal power—direct as to the moral law, indirect as to the temporal matters involved—Christ exercised when He drove the buyers and sellers from the Temple, and again when He cast the Gadarene swine into the sea; and the Pope exercised it when he condemned the Plan of Campaign in Ireland, the Falk Laws in Germany, the Divorce Courts in Christendom, when he upheld the claims of the French Republic, when he denounced the claims of the Italian monarchy.

Our fourth proposition runs thus, that the Roman Pontiff is, by divine right, exempt from and superior to all secular authority and civil jurisdiction of whatsoever kind or degree. This doctrine is an accepted conclusion of theology and is thus enunciated by Suarez:[6] "The Roman Pontiff is free and exempt from all secular judgment

[3] L. c., sec 4. [4] Ep. 255. Migne. P. L. Tom. 182, col. 462. [5] L. II., Sent. d. etq. ult. [6] Contra Sectam Anglic, L. 4, c. 4, n. 3.

and jurisdiction, even of Emperors and of Kings. This doctrine is held by all Catholic doctors who declare this exemption to be a divine right."

But in what sense "a divine right?" To answer that question clearly we must define our terms. What then is "a divine right?" St. Thomas says pithily: "Divine is that right which is made known to us by revelation."[7] Revelation, or promulgation, is, however, two-fold—natural (or non-positive) and positive; natural when it is implicitly given, as a logical concomitant or reasonable consequence of some supernatural dignity conferred by God on man; positive when it is given explicitly by God. As, therefore, a supernatural dignity expressly bestowed would be *de jure divino positivo*, its logical concomitant or necessary consequence, though not expressly mentioned, would be *de jure divino naturali*. In this acceptation of the term "natural" as distinguished, not against "supernatural," but against "positive," the positive precedes the natural as the cause precedes the effect.[8]

Papal exemption is then a divine right, but is it a positive or a natural right? Was it conferred on St. Peter and the Roman Pontiffs explicitly and directly by Christ's special and peculiar will, or is it merely connatural to and logically deducible from the spiritual dignity of the Head of Christendom? Suarez explains it to be a divine right in both senses, natural and positive; but positive only in a secondary way.

It is *de jure divino naturali* because as Christ constituted Peter and the Roman Pontiffs the Supreme Head in spirituals, it follows logically that He must also have conferred on His Vicar exemption from the secular jurisdiction of all and any of his spiritual subjects. A subject may not be the sovereign of his own Sovereign Lord. Suarez, however,[9] admits that this deduction is not without its difficulties. For might not an opponent argue that the Pope's supreme and direct spiritual jurisdiction and his supreme but indirect temporal jurisdiction on the one hand were not incompatible with his direct temporal subjection on the other? Does an official's superiority over another in one respect prevent his subjection to that other in another respect? Is not a King's mother superior to her son, but inferior to the King, just as the King as a son is inferior to his mother, but superior as her King? Without denying a certain cogency to this objection Suarez[10] replies: "Nevertheless the connection between the privilege of Exemption and the dignity of Spiritual Head, if not fully evident, is at least most consonant to reason; and in many ways. First, because the superior who gives jurisdiction is

[7] "Jus divinum dicitur quod divinitus promulgatur," 2-2, 57, 2, ad. 3m. [8] Cf. Schiffini. "Disp. Phil. Mor.," Vol. I., u. n. 195, 198. Suarez, Contra Sect. Aug., 4, 4-6. [9] l. c., n. 8. [10] l. c., n. 9.

also held to give all the adjuncts necessary for its due execution. Now, that the Pope may exercise his spiritual office over all Christians, princes and people, it is morally necessary that he should be himself subject to none of them. . . . For it is certainly unmeet that the Supreme Head of the Church, to whom all Christian princes are subject, should be judged, constrained or punished by any of them. Again, the Pope's secular subjection would be a standing cause of parties and divisions. Moreover, the Pope could not, with due liberty and authority, exercise his spiritual jurisdiction and use his indirect temporal power over princes if at the same time he was himself civilly subject to them and they were able legitimately to imprison and punish him. Therefore Papal Immunity is *de jure divino naturali.*"

But the Pope's Immunity is also *de jure divino positivo*[11] in this sense, not that Christ's explicit word first created the privilege, but only afterwards declared it. For Immunity is a logical deduction from the Spiritual Primacy, and the positive right superadded only declared explicitly the deduction to be true. Exemption already implicitly existing in the divine law, Christ, by a positive act, explicitly affirmed so to exist.

The classical proof of this positive and confirmatory act of our Lord is drawn from the Payment of the Tribute Scene in St. Matthew (xvii., 24-27), which reads thus:

"And when they were come to Capernaum, they that received tribute money came to Peter and said, Doth not your Master pay tribute? He saith, Yes. And when he was come into the house, Jesus forestalled him, saying, What thinkest thou, Simon? Of whom do the Kings of the earth take custom or tribute? Of their own children, or of strangers? Peter saith unto Him, Of strangers. Jesus saith unto him, Then are the children free. Notwithstanding, lest we should scandalize them, go thou to the sea and cast an hook and take up the fish that first cometh up, and when thou hast opened his mouth, thou shalt find a stater; take that, and give it to them for Me and for thee."

Thus Christ pays the tax for two, since the poll tax was two drachmas, and one stater equaled four drachmas. He paid, not because He and His Vicar were subject to the law, but to avoid scandal of the ignorant. Yet though He and Peter paid, nevertheless they were not taxed. The tax gatherers received the money, yet neither Christ nor Peter was mulcted of it. It was taken neither from their earnings nor from the common purse. Christ, therefore, a "Child of the King"—God—worked a striking miracle in order—without scandalizing the weak—to vindicate exemption and immun-

[11] Suarez, l. c., cap. 5.

ity from the law, both for Himself and for His Vicar, St. Peter, and in St. Peter for the whole line of the Roman Pontiffs.

We have now cleared the horizon by the brief statement of these four propositions; that the Pope has direct temporal power neither over the whole world, nor over the whole Christian world; that he has power—supreme, direct, spiritual, and supreme, indirect, temporal—over all Christendom, but not over heathendom; and that he is exempt from and superior to all secular authority whatsoever. We may now more conveniently pass on to our main investigation into the nature of the Roman Pontiff's *de jure* civil sovereignty over Rome and the Roman States. Of what right is it, divine or only human?

I reply that over no territory whatsoever has the Pope by divine right, natural or positive, direct temporal sovereignty. Therefore, not over Rome.

He has not a divine positive right, for no express command of God to that effect is found in either Scripture or Apostolic Tradition.

He has not a divine natural (*i. e.*, non-positive, but implicit) right deducible by reason as a corollary of his spiritual dignity of Supreme Pontiff. Of such a right there is no proof, as I shall now show.

Bellarmine and Suarez both deny the existence of such divine right, whether natural or positive.

Bellarmine's[12] argument is this, that since Christ, as Man, while He lived on earth, willed not Himself to possess temporal and territorial sovereignty over any particular province or city, so neither did He give any such sovereignty to St. Peter and his successors. It becomes, therefore, of importance to investigate what Christ's temporal authority before His Passion was. Christ, as God, was, of course, Sovereign of the Universe, but His authority as God He did not, and indeed could not, transfer to His Vicar. Again, Christ, as Man, was the spiritual Sovereign of all men, so that He could, and did, bind all men, under sanction of heaven or of hell, to accept His religion. By this direct spiritual, and therefore by its concomitant indirect temporal, jurisdiction Christ could dispose of all temporal possessions, as He did—to cite again the instances already quoted—when He overturned the tables of the money changers and indirectly caused the destruction of the Gadarene swine.[13] Moreover, Christ, even as Man, could—had He willed—have assumed territorial Lordship of the whole earth. He had the power to do so, but that power He did not will to exercise. Hence not only He did not exercise territorial dominion, He did not even possess it. For Temporal Princedom is built on one or more of these four titles—inheritance, popular election, conquest, divine donation—and Christ had none of them.

[12] De Rom. Pont., cap. 4. [13] Mk. v., 13; Mt. xxi., 12.

Not inheritance. For though descended from the royal family of David, there is no evidence that He was a nearer heir than a multitude of others of the same stock. Moreover, there was no throne in Judah to inherit, for the sceptre had passed out of David's family, and that, too, as it seems, with God's approval. For, speaking in God's name, Jeremiah the prophet[14] had clearly foretold that abolition of Jewish sovereignty. He predicted that no offspring of Jehoiakin, King of Judah, should sit upon David's temporal throne: "Thus saith the Lord, Write ye this man childless, a man that shall not prosper in his days; for no man of his seed shall prosper sitting upon the throne of David and ruling any more in Judah." And again:[15] "Thus saith the Lord of Jehoiakin, King of Judah: He shall have none to sit upon the throne of David." Now Christ was a descendant of Jehoiakin—or Jechonias—as St. Matthew expressly tells us.[16] Therefore as the prophecy was necessarily true, it must necessarily be false that Christ ever sat as temporal King on the throne of Judah.[17] Nor may we argue that Jeremiah's was inconsistent with Gabriel's prediction that "the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of David His father."[18] For both fathers and theologians explain that the prophet refers to a temporal, but the archangel to a spiritual throne.[19]

Not election by the people. Our Lord's own words prove this; for when He was invited to intervene, as a King might, in a dispute He replied: "Man, who made Me a judge or divider over you?"[20] And should it be argued that the sceptre was at least offered to Christ, the reply is obvious that neither was it the people's to give nor did He accept it: "When Jesus perceived that they would come and take Him by force, to make Him King, He departed again into a mountain Himself alone."[21]

Not conquest in war. For Christ's warfare was not with flesh and blood, but with principalities and with powers, with the rulers of this world of darkness, with the spirit of wickedness in high

---

[14] Jer. xxii., 30. [15] xxxvi., 30. [16] Matt. i., 11. [17] To invalidate this argument it has been objected, for example, in Smith's "Dict. of the Bible," s. r. "Jehoiachin," that Jeremiah's prophecy referred only to the childless Jehoiachin, the last of Solomon's (though not of David's) line; but that the right of succession duly passed to the line of Nathan, son of David, whose descendant, Salathiel, the son of Neri, was consequently called by St. Matthew i., 12, the son of Jehoiachin (or Jechonias): "Jechonias begat Salathiel." But this explanation seems very strained, not to say unnecessary. Professor N. J. White, in Hastings' "Dict. of the Bible," II., p. 557, writes: "Needless difficulty has been raised over the question of Jehoiachin's children. Whatever be the truth as to the parentage of Salathiel, the very prophecy which is alleged to prove his childlessness (Jer. xxii., 28) mentions his seed twice. Like Ezk. xxi., 26, it is a declaration of the abrogation of the temporal power of David's line. It explains in what sense he was to be 'childless' (ἐκκήρυκτον—'proscribed'), 'for no man of his seed shall prosper,' words surely unnecessary if he had no seed at all." [18] Lk. i., 32. [19] Cf. Ambrose. In Lk., L. 3, c. 1. Migne, P. L. Tom. 15, col. 1607. Jerome. In Jer. xxii., 30. Migne, P. L. Tom. 24, col. 819. Augustine, "De Civ. Dei," L. 17, c. 7. Migne. P. L. Tom. 41, col. 538. Bellarmine, "De Rom. Pont." v., 4. Suarez, "De Incar." xlviii., 1-3. [20] Lk. xxii., 14. [21] Jo. vi., 15.

places. This title Christ had, not to a temporal, but to His spiritual kingdom.

Not a divine donation. For there is no proof of any such gift. Nay, there is clear proof against it. To relieve Pilate of all suspicion that He aimed at a temporal sceptre, our Lord declared that His Kingdom was not of this world.[22]

Under no title, then, was our Lord, as Man, a temporal Prince over Judæa. Moreover, to Him royal power would have been not an aid, but a hindrance. For the end to attain which He came on earth, the redemption of mankind, supreme power was indeed needed, but spiritual and not temporal power. We must bear in mind, too, that by virtue of that spiritual power He possessed indirect jurisdiction over all things temporal to dispose of them as He knew best for spiritual purposes. Therefore temporal power would have been superfluous. Nay, it would have been positively harmful. It would have stood as a stumbling-block in the path of Christ's ascetic teaching. For our Lord both by example and word—since "He came to do and to teach,"[23] "not to be ministered unto, but to minister"[24]—sought to lead men to despise wealth and position and honor and power and glory. Therefore with what playful sarcasm He questioned those who had gone out into the desert in quest of John the Baptist:[25] "What went ye out to see? A man clothed in soft raiment? Behold they that wear soft clothing are in the houses of Kings."

Christ neither exercised temporal and territorial sovereignty over Judæa nor possessed it. Theologians teach that He had neither the use nor the dominion. Bellarmine[26] writes: "Christ was in the fullest sense a poor man as regards both use and dominion." Nor is Suarez less emphatic:[27] "Christ assumed dominion neither over the whole world nor over any temporal kingdom . . . as His poverty evinces. For perfect evangelical poverty consists in the renunciation of all things temporal, as regards not only use, but also power and dominion over them."

David's temporal throne was, therefore, but a figure of Christ's spiritual throne. It follows, then, that as He had not territorial sovereignty Himself, so neither did He give it to Peter and his successors. For the Pope exercises that same visible office which Christ, as Man, exercised during His temporal life and before His Passion. The prerogatives of the Risen Christ, immortal and glorified, were not transmitted to Peter and the Roman Pontiffs. Peter and the Popes rule the Church as Christ ruled it before His crucifixion.

---

[22] Jo. xviii., 36. [23] Acts i., 1. [24] Mk. x., 45. [25] Mt. xi., 18. [26] op. cit. v., 4. [27] "De Incar." xlviii., 2, 5.

I do not mean, of course, and the distinction is of supreme importance—that to Peter Christ, even as Man, communicated all His power. Theologians distinguish a three-fold dominion and jurisdiction—divine, human, dei-virile.[28] The first belongs to God as God; it is essentially independent and incommunicable, and Christ, as Man, was subject to it. The second belongs to man, as man; it is mainly founded on human suffrages; its end is to preserve the State in peace and concord. The third belongs to Christ as Man, but as Man substantially united to God; it is a function of the Man-God, and is styled the "dominion of excellence." It stands midway between the divine and the human. It is inferior to the divine because it is subordinate to God. It is superior to the human, and that in at least three ways: in origin, coming directly from God and not from man; in stability, being eternal; in object, extending to all creation, natural and supernatural, men and angels. Hence every jot and tittle of that temporal sovereignty which Emperors and Kings possess, and incomparably more, Christ the Man-God wielded *eminenter*, not indirectly but directly, for the attainment not merely of spiritual but also of temporal ends. By this "dominion of excellence" Christ, as Man, by His own power and by virtue of His own authority, worked miracles, uttered prophecies, instituted sacraments, forgave sins without a sacrament.

Now of these three, Christ gave to Peter and the Popes neither divine dominion nor the "dominion of excellence,"[29] for they were not comunicable, nor yet human dominion, for it was not His to give. Nay, even their spiritual jurisdiction He restricted to the faithful: "Feed My sheep, feed My lambs." Of that jurisdiction which can be conferred on a mere man and which was necessary for the government of Christians unto eternal life, He transferred to them only a part.

Hence St. Thomas writes:[30] "Theologians attribute to Christ a certain power possessed neither by Peter nor his successors. They call it the 'power of excellence.' Therefore the power of Peter and his successors does not equal Christ's power. Nay, His power utterly exceeds theirs. For Christ could save without baptism. And consequently Jerome says that Christ cured no man's body without at the same time curing his soul, and that without baptism. Yet Peter could not do as much, for even after the coming of the Holy Ghost he baptized with water Cornelius the Centurion and all his family. Christ, too, could change both form and matter of the sacraments, which Peter and his successors could not."

The Popes have no divine right to the Roman States. This propo-

[28] Suarez, "De Incar." xlviii., 2, 4. [29] Suarez, "De Incar." xlvii., 1, 4. [30] "De Regimine Principum," iii., 10.

sition I may now be allowed to support by authority. Bellarmine says emphatically: "The Pope has, directly and by divine right, no merely temporal jurisdiction."[31]

Nor is Suarez less explicit:[32] "Christ gave no temporal dominion directly and immediately to the Roman Church; but what she actually possesses comes from the donation of Emperors and Kings." And again:[33] "By the title of *donation* only has the Pope direct temporal jurisdiction over the patrimony of St. Peter given by Constantine." And again:[34] "Christ neither instituted the Pope a sovereign prince nor commanded him to be so instituted."

In the following passage the mind of Suarez is made clear beyond all possibility of mistake:[35] "Christ did not *forbid* the Pope to be a temporal prince. For no such prohibition can be adduced. Nor is it essentially wrong for one and the same individual to be both Prince and Pastor. On the contrary—although too ample a temporal sway would not be in keeping with spiritual duties—nevertheless a moderately sized temporal princedom is not only permissible, it is even expedient for the maintenance of the Church's authority and splendor, to provide the necessary income, and for other similar purposes. Christ, therefore, did not prohibit a temporal sovereignty, but left it to human arrangement, regulated by right reason, and to the opportunities which time would offer."

The Temporal Power of the Popes over the Roman States is therefore *de jure humano* only.

I have labored rather to prove this conclusion, because it is of great importance, and it has been seriously controverted. At least two modern writers have made earnest, interesting and able attempts to prove a divine right for the Temporal Power. They have striven to adduce Scriptural warrant to show that it is *de jure divino positivo*, and therefore (I presume) that the denial of it would be formally heretical. I refer to the Hon. Colin Lindsay's learned work, "De Ecclesia et Cathedra; or, The Empire-Church of Jesus Christ," and to the Rev. C. F. P. Collingridge's careful thesis on "The Civil Principality of Christ."

Mr. Lindsay[36] writes: "It is *evident* then that the principle of the Temporal Power, long ago foretold by the prophets, would be continued in the Christian Dispensation, and that the place wherein it would be established was ancient and Imperial Rome, at that time the future metropolis and centre of Christendom."

And again:[37] "The principle of the Temporal Power is one originally ordained by God. . . . The Temporal Power has been established upon earth as a *divine* principle."

---

31 Op. cit. v., 4. 32 De Leg. iii., 2, 5. 33 Cont. Sect. Angl. iii., 5, 13. 34 Ibid, n. 19. 35 Ibid, n. 19. 36 P. 902. 37 P. 918.

Father Collingridge,[38] after implying that the Temporal Power "is an *essential* part of the Divine Plan," writes: "I maintain that the Civil Principality or Temporal Princedom is a gift of Jesus Christ and a divine institution foreshadowed in the Old Testament and vindicated in the New." In other words, it is *de jure divino positivo!*

I am bound, however, to confess that Mr. Lindsay's argumentation seems to me, in large measure, fanciful, and that Father Collingridge deduces from his premises far more than they logically contain. I fail to see that either writer has proved more than the two conclusions which are common-places in theology, viz., that Christ possessed the "dominion of excellence" and that the Roman Pontiff is exempt from secular jurisdiction. Both authors assume that our Lord was, by divine right, a territorial King in Judæa, that He gave that right to Peter and the Popes, and that He transferred the seat of empire from Jerusalem to Rome. Father Collingridge[39] writes: "Jesus the Son of David was therefore the last bearer of the sceptre of Juda." It seems to me abundantly plain that He was not. Bellarmine[40] says: "From *this false principle* that Christ, as Man, was a temporal King, two opposing errors have arisen," etc. Before Father Collingridge, Mr. Lindsay had written:[41] "This principle of the Temporal Power was clearly and unequivocally established by God and that principle is indelible." Suarez, however, thought otherwise:[42] "The Pope's temporal kingdom was founded, not immediately by God, but by the devotion of men, or by some other similar cause."

It might, perhaps, be objected that both Popes and theologians were for centuries mistaken in their contention that the Temporal Power was based, wholly or mainly, on the so-called Donation of Constantine. I think they were mistaken. But how does that vitiate their conclusion? They deny unanimously that the Temporal Power is *de jure divino*, whatever the precise title may be on which it is held; "hominum devotione, vel alio simili humano titulo."[43]

But may it not be argued that having proved Papal Exemption from secular jurisdiction to be *de jure divino*, it follows that the Popes, not being subjects, must, with equal right, be sovereigns? Is not every non-subject a sovereign? In a prefatory letter to Father Collingridge's booklet, Cardinal Vaughan seems to lend his weighty support to this opinion. His Eminence writes:[44] "The great theologian, Suarez, who speaks for the whole school, says that Christ declared Peter to be exempt from tribute, just as He Himself was, and that we are to understand that Christ granted this privilege

[38] P. 8. [39] P. 27. [40] Op. cit. v., 4. [41] P. 877. [42] "Contra Sect. Angl." iv., 4, 1. [43] Suarez, l. c. [44] P. 5.

of exemption to Peter because Peter was to be Prince and Head of the Church and the Vicar of Jesus Christ Himself. This privilege was, therefore, not personal to Peter, but real, and attached to the dignity and office which passes on to his successors in virtue of Divine power and of the peculiar institution and will of Christ. If tribute be the sign of temporal dependence and subjection, he who is not really subject to the payment of tribute is not really under temporal subjection."

Thus far His Eminence's argument is uncontrovertible. It is the same argument which has been sketched out in the preceding pages. It is the common opinion of theologians. Moreover, I have shown that Peter's non-subjection is undoubtedly *de jure divino*. But the letter then continues:

"The Pope is independent. If independent, he is sovereign. The principle of the temporal independence of the Pope appears to be contained in the text of the Gospel just referred to."

His Eminence's argument runs thus:

With what right a person is exempt from secular subjection, with that same right he is a secular sovereign.

But with divine positive right the Pope is so exempt.

Therefore with divine positive right the Pope is a secular sovereign.

I may remark that even thus the Cardinal's contention does not by any means reach the level at any rate of Mr. Lindsay's. The former draws the conclusion that the Pope is *de jure divino a* sovereign, but the latter that he is *the* sovereign of Rome.

I should like, if possible, to endorse the Cardinal's argument, but I must confess my inability to follow His Eminence's reasoning. With much mistrust of my own judgment, I venture to express a doubt as to the validity of the above syllogism. The minor is undeniably true; but can the major be proved? Is it evident that every non-subject is of necessity a sovereign? I think not. Not to go beyond the Scripture passage in question,[45] are not "the children of Kings" exempt from taxation and yet are they sovereign? Our Lord Himself was preëminently exempt, and yet He was not a sovereign. Is it therefore certain that the essentially non-subject Pope is also essentially a sovereign? Suppose the nations of Europe united (as they might) to guarantee the exemption and immunity of the present Prisoner of the Vatican, the Pope would be non-subject, but he would not be a sovereign.

Let us, however, examine the question on a lower ground. The Pope is *de jure divino positivo* non-subject; does it not logically follow that he is at least *de jure divino naturali* sovereign? Is not some

[45] Matt. xvii., 25.

sovereignty—if not sovereignty over Rome—a logical and necessary *deduction* from the Pope's non-subjection? Again I am constrained to answer in the negative.

But again it may be objected against me that not only is the deduction necessary, but that both the Papacy and the Episcopacy have repeatedly declared it to be necessary. Take two instances. In his Allocution of March 12, 1877, Pius IX. said: "In no way does the Roman Pontiff possess, nor can he ever possess, full liberty, or exercise his full authority, so long as he is subject to others ruling in his city. In Rome he must be either a sovereign or a captive."[46]

And in his Letters of September 20, 1895, Leo XIII. wrote: "Nothing can ever confer true independence on the Papacy so long as it has no temporal jurisdiction."[47]

Both Popes therefore maintain the *necessity* of temporal sovereignty.

I reply that they do not maintain it as a necessary *deduction* from exemption. They never claim that it is *de jure divino*. On the contrary they expressly refrain from that claim. The Temporal Power is, in these days, a *practical* necessity. For with all the facts clearly before them, the authorities have never affirmed more than this, that the Temporal Power came to the Holy See, "not as the effect of chance," but "by a peculiar design of Divine Providence," and "by a special disposition of God"—as Father Collingridge himself bears witness.[48] With all the data before them on which to base a sound judgment—for the present imbroglio is not new, since Rome has nine times already been captured by enemies—the authorities have ever advocated divine right of any kind for the Temporal Power. Neither in the Collections of the Councils, nor in the Bullarium, nor in the Acta Sanctæ Sedis, nor in the tomes of any father, doctor or theologian—so far as I am aware—is there on the one hand a single passage which maintains the divine right of the Temporal Princedom, while on the other hand there are scores of passages which explicitly affirm that right to be merely human.

However, let us look more closely into this most important question of the *necessity* of the Temporal Power. Is the Civil Princedom of the Popes really *necessary?* I reply that both from extrinsic authority and from intrinsic evidence we know for certain that it is.

Before, however, setting forth the rulings of ecclesiastical authority, I may first point out that this doctrine of *necessity* is not new. It was taught by the Holy See at least as far back as the thirteenth century. On August 4, 1278,[49] in the Encyclical Letter, *Fundamenta Militantis Ecclesiae*, addressed to the French Bishops, Pope

[46] "Acta Sanctae Sedis," 1877, p. 57. [47] "Acta S. Sedis," 1895, p. 200. [48] P. 5.
[49] Bullarium Romanum, Mainard, Tom. III., pt. 2, p. 23.

Nicholas III. wrote: "That Holy Mother Church, in her pastoral care of the faithful, should not stand in need of temporal aids; nay, rather, in order that, helped by them, she might ever progress in spiritual growth; *not without a miracle* was the design conceived by Constantine of leaving the City of Rome to Pope Sylvester. . . . For Constantine deemed it unmeet that where the Heavenly King had established the High Priest and Head of the Christian Religion, there an earthly Emperor should hold sway. Nay, rather he held that Peter's See, now established on the throne of Rome, should possess full liberty in its action, nor be subject to any man, seeing that by divine choice (aere divino) it is known to have been set over all."

Of all arguments for the Temporal Power, the chief—at least for Catholics—is that from authority. For a Catholic the high road to certain truth in religion is not the beaten path of argument. His Church, with her supreme authority, must be to him the ultimate court of appeal. Such a one will look to the authoritative decisions of Popes or Councils, to the sense of the Church expounded by theologians, to the traditional view prevalent among pastors and people. And on this subject of the Temporal Power all these authorities are at one. Three quotations will set this assertion in a clear light.

Pius IX. in his Encyclical of 18 June, 1859, and addressed to all the Bishops of the Church, said: "We publicly proclaim that a Civil Princedom is necessary to this Holy See, that it may be able to exercise its sacred power without any impediment."

And again in Apostolic Letters of 16 March, 1860: "Since the Catholic Church, founded and instituted by Christ the Lord to procure the eternal salvation of men, has, by virtue of its divine institution, obtained the form of a perfect society, it ought consequently to possess such liberty that in the exercise of its sacred ministry it should be subject to no civil power. And because to act freely, it needed defenses corresponding to the condition and necessity of the times, therefore, by a *decidedly singular counsel* of Divine Providence, it happened that when the Roman Empire fell and was divided into several kingdoms, the Roman Pontiff, whom Christ has constituted the Head and Centre of His whole Church, acquired a Civil Princedom, whereby in truth it was most wisely provided by God Himself that, amidst such a multitude and variety of temporal Princes, the Sovereign Pontiff should enjoy that political liberty which is so *necessary* that he may exercise his spiritual power, authority and jurisdiction throughout the whole world, without any impediment."

Thirdly, the Bishops assembled in Rome in 1862 in an Address dated July 9 repeated this doctrine. That Address may be looked upon as coming from the whole episcopate, seeing that it was signed

by 265 Bishops in Rome, that many at a distance afterwards sent in their adhesion and that the Pope accepted and approved it. The document ran thus:

"We recognize the Civil Princedom of the Holy See as something *necessary* and manifestly instituted by God's Providence, nor do we hesitate to declare that in the present state of human things this Civil Princedom is altogether *required for the good and free government* of the Church. It was assuredly necessary that the Roman Pontiff should not be the subject, nay, not even the mere guest, of any Prince, but that, residing in a kingdom and dominion of his own, he should be his own master. . . By all of us, therefore, it is to be held *as most certain* that this temporal rule did not fortuitously accrue to the Holy See, but by *a special disposition of God* was assigned to it, and during a long series of years confirmed and preserved to it, with the unanimous consent of all kingdoms and empires and *almost by a miracle.*"[50]

The summary of the doctrine laid down in these passages is this: First, that the Temporal Power was established and maintained by God through a special Providence;[51] secondly, that it has been beneficial; thirdly, that it was, and still is, necessary for the Church; fourthly, that its beneficial character and necessity continue to the present day; and fifthly, that all this is most certain.

The Temporal Power, therefore, is undoubtedly, in some sense at least, necessary. But with what degree of necessity? This necessity is one "corresponding to the condition and necessity of the times"—as Pius IX. expressed it, in the language of the Bishops—"in the present state of human things." It is a necessity, not absolute but relative, not essential but accidental. It is essential neither to the existence of the Church nor to the indispensable action of the Holy Father. That much seems plain from these two facts alone: First, that the Church existed in the Catacombs without any Temporal Power, either *de jure* or *de facto*, for some three centuries; secondly, that she exists now without that power *de facto*. Moreover, it is clear that, by a change in His Providence, God could make the Church flourish more without than she ever flourished with her civil sovereignty.

The Temporal Power, therefore, is necessary to the Church; not to her *esse*, but her *bene esse;* not to her being, but her well-being.

But to what degree of well-being? Well-being is an elastic term and admits of a very considerable latitude of interpretation. For example, is a mechanic in a state of well-being with thirty shillings a

[50] Quoted in extenso by Father Collingridge, p. 70. [51] By "Providence" is understood that care which God takes of His creatures both in the natural and supernatural orders. It is the natural or supernatural *provision* which He makes for them.

week? Or a County Court Judge with thirty pounds? Or the Archbishop of Canterbury with three hundred pounds? Or a merchant prince with three thousand pounds? If these are all cases of well-being—as they seem to be—they are certainly not the same well-being. Then for what *degree* of well-being is the Temporal Power *necessary* to the Church? I think I am safe in saying that the authorities quoted understand a well-being that is not superlative, not superfluous; not a well-being of extreme prosperity, but a well-being such as is reasonably due to the Church, such as is in keeping with her state, such that without it she would be hampered and embarrassed, such that if it were lost permanently she would be in a state, not indeed of ruin but of want, not of collapse but of distress.

That answer, however, does not quite solve the problem. For what is a due well-being? Protestants think the Church has a due well-being now; Catholics are sure she has not. Who is to define what is fit and becoming as regards her well-being? A somewhat similar difficulty confronted Aristotle in his definition of "Virtue." According to him, virtue stands in the mean.[52] But what is the mean? Neither excess nor defect. But what is excess and what is defect? If a rich Duke gives a half-penny for the Westminster Cathedral, and the poor widow in the Gospel gives to the Temple two mites, which make a farthing,[53] would the Duke be twice as generous as the widow? No, for the mean is not absolute, but relative—relative to the individual. Well, then, what donation would be generous in a Duke? For if the mean is relative, who is to define it? Aristotle replies: "Defined by reason." Yes, but whose reason? The miser's or the spendthrift's, Shylock's or Antonio's? Aristotle again answers and finally: "As the *prudent* man would define it." Who, then, are the "prudent men" fit to define what is necessary to the due well-being of the Church? The Pope and Bishops.

I have said that the Temporal Power is so necessary to the Church that without it she would be straitened, but not starved. It is necessary for the modest competence of the Church. And in thus saying I mean, not the Church of the Catacombs before she reached her adult stature, but as she is now, in her normal condition, widespread, full-grown, mature. Moreover, I mean the Church in her permanent condition and not in a state of passing trials and occasional disturbances.

But another obscurity presents itself. This well-being, defined as necessary by the "prudent," is it that moderate well-being which duly befits the Church, or is a minimum rigidly due to the Church? Is it only that which ought to be there, or is it that which must be

[52] Ethics, B. 2, c. 6, n. 10. [53] Mk. xii., 42.

there and which God has promised shall be there? Unless He found a substitute for the Temporal Power, God of course could not positively will its final extinction; but could He permit it? Would such permission invalidate His promises? Has God guaranteed that it shall not become finally extinct? If He has, then He will restore it. If He has, then the Papal and episcopal declarations of necessity imply that the final abolition of the Temporal Power is a moral impossibility and that God is bound to and therefore will reëstablish it.

I must, however, confess that a degree of necessity so high as that seems to me theologically incapable of demonstration. I hope the Temporal Power will be restored. I hold, personally, arguing from past historical analogies and from present political embarrassments, that it will be restored. But that such restoration is certain, that divine guarantees make it certain, that Pope and Bishops implicitly declare it to be certain—where is the proof? Christ said:[54] "When the Son of Man cometh, shall He find faith on the earth?" And in like manner we may ask: "Shall He find His Church in possession of her Temporal Power?" Who knows?[55]

Next, if we pass from the declarations of authority to the dictates of reason, it is not hard to assign grounds for the necessity of the Pope's civil sovereignty. Those grounds I propose to explain at length in another article, but they are summed up in the sentence of Pius IX.: "That the Holy See may be able to exercise its sacred power without any impediment." In a word, these are the main reasons: To secure freedom from secular dictation; to possess ability to carry on, without let or hindrance, the world-wide government of the Church; to enjoy the possession of competent revenues for that purpose; to wield the power necessary to uphold the dignity and even the splendor of the Pope's unique position.

Let us next ask what precise obligation lies on Catholics to accept this teaching? How far is a Catholic bound to recognize the necessity of the Temporal Sovereignty? Is that necessity a mere opinion? Is it a dogma of the faith? Or is it a doctrine intermediate between mere opinion and absolute dogma? In view of the loose views prevalent on this subject, this question calls for a clear reply.

Would a denial of the necessity of the Temporal Power be heresy? For those writers who think the Temporal Power to be of positive divine right—"clearly, evidently and unequivocally," as Mr. Lindsay holds—and writ plain in Scripture, perhaps it would.

---

[54] Lk. xviii., 8. [55] On this subject there is a curious speculation in Suarez, "Contra Sect. Angl.," v. 7, 9 and 11, that Rome will perhaps some day be destroyed, its buildings uprooted and the whole city burned to the ground and blotted out. Nor does he think that such an event would run counter to the divine promises in behalf of the Church, since Peter's See shall never fail whether it be set up in this place or that, whether the Church remain visible or be driven by persecution to fly to the mountains or to hide in secret holes. As the Church began in the Catacombs, he thinks it not improbable that she may end in them.

Again, for those who hold it to be a natural divine right, the denial might be heretical.

But, as I have said before, I doubt if there be reasonable grounds —I am sure there is no obligation—to hold either of these superlative opinions. No one is *bound* to believe that the Temporal Power is based on anything higher than human right, though he must hold that a special Providence guided men to confer that right.

This then is the practical question: What is the obligation to submit, founded on the plain, repeated and authoritative teaching of the Papacy and the Episcopacy? That question I shall now strive to answer.

In a letter of His Eminence Cardinal Prosper Caterini, Prefect of the S. Congregation of the Council of Trent, and written by command and under the direction of Pius IX., after granting that "the matter in question does not *directly* concern the faith," the writer says:[56] "To assert that the doctrine as to the necessity and fitness of the Civil Princedom of the Holy See is a novelty of but recent introduction is historically false and *doctrinally erroneous*. It is equivalent to attributing error and usurpation to the Popes who have received and maintained their temporal sovereignty over the States of the Church and to gainsaying the two celebrated Councils of Lyons and Constance, which both, by word and deed, have sanctioned this Temporal Princedom. To assert the contrary would be to renew the error of Arnold of Brescia, Calvin and other heretics, who in their hostility to the Church and the See of Rome taught that it was foreign to the spirit of the Gospel to conjoin spiritual jurisdiction with civil power—a proposition deservedly branded as *heretical*."

According to Caterini, therefore, to call the necessity of the Temporal Power a novelty is doctrinally erroneous and "equivalent" to heresy.

A practical test of the Church's mind on this subject is supplied by the fact that when in 1877 Father Curci, S. J.—one of the most distinguished men of his order—held and taught the non-necessity of the Temporal Power, he was called upon to recant and, refusing, was expelled from the Society of Jesus, of which for forty years he had been so bright an ornament.

Moreover, the Syllabus of Pius IX. contains two condemned propositions touching the Civil Princedom which throw a very clear light on the obligations of Catholics. One denies the necessity of the Temporal Power; the other affirms its extinction to be beneficial. But before citing them verbatim I may be allowed to preface their quotation with a few words of explanation.

The Syllabus was published as an appendix to the Encyclical

[56] The letter is printed in the *Month*, February, 1869, p. 195.

"Quanta Cura," of December 8, 1864, and is a catalogue of propositions enunciating the principal errors of the day, all of which had been already condemned before the Syllabus appeared.[57] The censure under which each proposition is branded is not affixed in the Syllabus, and to discover what the particular note of condemnation is recourse must be had to the original Papal document in which each error was originally stigmatized. It is certain, however, that not all were condemned as heretical. Some of them evidently deserve a minor censure, such as "false" or "erroneous" or "rash" or "impious" or "dangerous" or "scandalous." Again, it is certain that many, at least, of the condemnations are not "doctrinal Pontifical definitions, not ex-cathedral judgments." Fessler[58] expressly teaches this: "It is certain that several of the documents containing these condemnations and from which the proscribed propositions are drawn, do not contain Papal definitions or ex-cathedral judgments."

There is, however, a further question. When Pius IX., in the Syllabus, renewed the condemnation of these proscribed propositions *in globo*, did he raise the original censures to the dignity of definitions of faith? It cannot be proved that he did. To quote Fessler again:[59] "Did the Pope, from the fact of his sending the Syllabus to the whole episcopate, mean to raise the censures passed by him to the dignity of definitions of faith, such as, according to the dogmatic decision of the Vatican Council, would constitute a formal judgment *ex-cathedra?* That is a question about which many theologians think it permissible to raise a doubt, until at any rate there comes a new declaration from the Holy See."

The two condemned propositions concerning the Temporal Power are, therefore, not heretical. They are, however, "false and perverse opinions." For in the concluding sentence of the *Quanta Cura*[60] all the propositions of the Syllabus are collectively proscribed and condemned as, at least, "false and perverse opinions and to be so proscribed and condemned by all true children of the Catholic Church." Moreover, in the Syllabus itself, in a note appended to the two condemned propositions in question, it is laid down that the contradictions of these are to be most firmly held by all Catholics.[61]

But, it may be asked, are Catholics bound to accept anything more than the dogmas of the Church? To that question Pius IX. returned an emphatic answer in the Brief *Tuas Libenter*, addressed to the Archbishop of Munich December 21, 1863: "It is not enough to venerate and receive the dogmas of the Church. It is further necessary to submit to the doctrinal decisions of the Pontifical Congrega-

[57] Cf. Hergenröther, "Church and State," Essay V. [58] "True and False Infallibility," French Trans., p. 133. [59] P. 134. [60] Denzinger, "Enchiridion," n. 1,547. [61] Denzinger, n. 1,625.

tions, as also to those heads of doctrine which by the common and constant consent of Catholics are held as theological truths and as conclusions so certain that though the opposite opinion cannot be called heretical, nevertheless it deserves some other theological censure."[62]

But might not an opponent argue that though the two propositions in question have undoubtedly been condemned as false and perverse opinions, and though the Pope has declared that Catholics are bound so to hold them, yet that neither condemnation nor declaration need be taken to bind under a grave obligation? For is it an infallible declaration that these two propositions are false and perverse opinions? If the proscribed propositions themselves are not heretical, but only false, would it be heretical to deny that they are false? Is the Syllabus infallible? I reply that the Syllabus cannot be proved to be infallible, nevertheless that it binds under a grave obligation. Hence Christian Pesch, S. J., writes:[63] "Although some have doubted whether the Syllabus be a formal ex-cathedral definition, still the propositions whereof the Syllabus is an authoritative catalogue have been condemned by the Pope in such a way as to show that he intended to bind the Universal Church to reject them. This, too, is proved by the unanimous consent of the Catholic Episcopate, since no Catholic is now allowed to defend these proscribed propositions. But what note must be affixed on individual propositions, and with what degree of assent the opposite doctrines must be held is to be gathered partly from the documents out of which the propositions have been culled, partly from the subject matter."

Therefore the Syllabus, if not formally, is at any rate practically infallible. For it is the common teaching of theologians that the Church is substantially infallible in branding false doctrines, whatever be the note with which she may proscribe them. De Lugo writes:[64] "Theologians commonly admit that the Church's judgment in affixing these minor censures is certain. To say that the Church can err in this judgment is an error, or is allied to error. To persist in saying it Malder holds to be heretical. To say that the Supreme Pontiff can err in decreeing these censures Turrian stigmatizes as an error, while I think it to be erroneous or proximate to error, since the infallible assistance of the Holy Ghost promised to the Church should not, I think, be limited to dogmas proposed as *de fide*, but it ought to extend to all those subjects which the faithful at the bidding of the Church are bound to believe."

The obligation, then, is grave. But to what sort of an assent is it an obligation—internal or only external? Is it only an obligation to

[62] Denzinger, n. 1,537. [63] "Institutiones Propaedenticae," Vol. I., n. 520. [64] "De Virtute Fidei Divinae," D. 20, sec. 3, nn. 108,109.

observe a decorous silence? That question hardly merits a reply. However, the Encyclical *Quanta Cura* puts the matter beyond dispute. Pius IX. wrote:[65] "We cannot pass over in silence the foolhardiness of those who, not enduring sound doctrine, maintain that it is possible, without sin and without any detriment to the Catholic profession, to withhold assent and obedience to those judgments and decrees of the Apostolic See the object of which is declared to refer to the Church's general good, her rights and her discipline. How profoundly opposed this opinion is to the Catholic dogma of the plenitude of power in the Roman Pontiff, divinely conferred on him by Christ Himself, of feeding, ruling and governing the Universal Church, any one in his senses can understand."

The Pope says "assent and obedience." Had he said "obedience" alone a strained construction might have limited it to merely external acts. But he adds also "assent," which can only refer to internal conformity both of intellect and of will. The Holy Father's teaching is then clear that we cannot without sin, and without grave sin—that is, without detriment to our Catholic profession—withhold internal assent to the converse of these condemned propositions.

With that preamble I now proceed to quote the proscribed propositions in question. The former affirms the *necessity* of the Temporal Power to be doubtful: "The children of the Christian and Catholic Church are not at one *(disputant)* as to the compatibility of the Temporal and Spiritual Powers."

The latter goes further and affirms not only that the Temporal Power is not necessary, but that its abolition would be *beneficial:* "The abolition of the Temporal Power, whereof the Apostolic See is possessed, would greatly contribute to the Church's liberty and prosperity."[66]

I quoted above Caterini's judgment, endorsed by Pius IX,. that to hold these branded propositions was "doctrinally erroneous and equivalent to heresy." I end by quoting a similar criticism on the same propositions, passed by one whose theological erudition and well-balanced judgment have hardly been surpassed in our generation. I refer to Father Edmund J. O'Reilly, S. J., some time professor of theology, first at Maynooth, then at St. Beuno's, North Wales, and finally in the Catholic University of Ireland. In his book, "The Relations of the Church to Society,"[67] he writes about these propositions: "The question, therefore, is *not* debated among sound Catholics. Indeed, I look upon the condemnation of the Pope's Temporal Power *as constructive heresy.* For if the Temporal Power is wrong, the Church, too, is wrong in a way in which our faith forbids us to admit she can be wrong." And in a masterly

[65] Denzinger, n. 1,547. [66] Denzinger, nn. 1624, 1625 [67] P. 345.

article in the *Month*[68] the same theologian writes even more sternly: "What is to be thought of those professing Catholics who pretend that the extinction of the Temporal Power would be beneficial to the Church? Taking into account the Papal and Episcopal declarations, and at the same time the action of the Popes, and the sense of the Church manifested in many ways for ages, I cannot bring myself to believe that such a view falls short of *heresy, at least of constructive heresy.* I do not want to imply that it is contradictorily opposed to a dogmatic definition on the utility of the Temporal Power, but that it obviously charges the Church with a very serious error, doctrinal and practical; for if that condemned view be right, the Church is grievously and mischievously mistaken concerning her own condition, and has been so for ages. And such an imputation cannot be cleared of heresy."

Our obligations in regard to the Temporal Power are, therefore, very grave; much graver indeed than many Catholics seem to realize.

CHARLES COUPE, S. J.

Stoneyhurst, Engl nd.

FROM SILVIO PELLICO TO FRANCESCO CRISPI.

LITERATURE stands at one end of the chain of Italian Revolution, License at the other. Both were well personified, the one in the gentle prisoner of the *piombi*, and the other in the wrecker of the Roman Bank. In the same sense that the poet makes Hamlet bitterly cry, "Frailty, thy name is Woman," it may be truly said of the demagogic ideal, "Liberty, thy name is Avernus." Once embarked on that fatal slope, there is no halting until the depths where ruin lurks are touched. There can hardly be a doubt that the writings of Silvio Pellico were the means which won that intense outside sympathy with Italian conspiracy without which it could hardly have achieved the ambiguous success it did. A very large number of persons, well-meaning and influential, in England as well as on the continent of Europe, and not a few in the United States, were greatly moved at the recital of prison sufferings in Italy. And, while this fact is creditable to the humanity of such sentimentalists, it must not be suffered to obscure the moral of the episode that in the several countries wherein those philanthropists shed the gentle ray of their influence on human progress, there existed, in Silvio

[68] September, 1871, p. 186.

Pellico's day, and for many years afterward, prison systems no less revolting to the sense of humanity than those depicted with such graphic force by the poetic Italian revolutionist.

It was in Great Britain that the Italian Revolution found its largest number of sympathizers, and it is a very suggestive fact that Great Britain is the only one of the civilized powers which draws now no distinction between political prisoners and ordinary criminals. Much sympathy found expression in the United States also, and it is therefore useful to recall what Dickens said of the American penitentiary system about the same period as witnessed the beginnings of the Italian Revolution. One of its most terrible results was the alarming increase of insanity among the convicts.

No doubt there were many really philanthropic persons in the ranks of those who denounced Neapolitan and Venetian and Austrian methods of rule and prison treatment, as well here as in Great Britain, at that particular epoch. But in their enthusiasm these for the most part overlooked the fact that in Ireland, on the one part, there was then actually existent a state of things, politically and socially, absolutely without parallel, for bungling despotism and acute physical suffering spread over wide areas, in any part of the globe; and on the other that the system of Negro slavery was one of the institutions of the land. Therefore, it required the hardihood of guileless unconsciousness for any one, even a statesman of Mr. Gladstone's rank and character, to advert to any political or social system, outside Ireland and the British prison system, as a "negation of God."

Yet it was by means of the feeling begotten of such appeals that the Italian Revolution was nursed, from infancy to maturity. So incessantly did Italian writers like Azeglio and Guerazzi din the enormities of Bourbon and Papal rule into the ear of Europe, that numerous deluded sympathizers became firmly persuaded that the picture had no side but the sable one, and that the men who were banded together for the overthrow of Bourbon and Papal rule were patriots of the purest type, who sought to accomplish their ends by purely legitimate means. Of course Englishmen like Palmerston and Stansfeld, who had traveled in Italy, knew better. They were fully aware that all the most dangerous elements in Italian life were engaged in the general insurrectionary movement. They knew Mazzini and the doctrine he preached; they knew the Carbonari and its constituent elements; they knew the Mafia and Camorra—and knowing all these fearful resources of Revolution, and the predominant power they held in its counsels, they yet did not hesitate to render to the cause all the aid and comfort they were capable of bringing, directly and indirectly.

In framing a bill of indictment against the Papacy not the least scruple was shown about laying at its door the sins of its neighbors. Austrian repression in the Quadrilateral and Venetia, and the tyranny of the Bourbons in the Two Sicilies, the misrule of the Duchies of Tuscany, Parma and Modena—all these were named, habitually, in the same breath with the rule in the States of the Church, and all anathematized undiscriminatingly by British and other sympathizers with the Revolution.

Somehow it appears to have been altogether overlooked by at least British sympathizers with the Italian Revolution that the responsibility for Italian turmoil lay, not at the door of the Pope, but at that of the great powers of Europe. After the overthrow of Napoleon these irresponsible parties, through their representatives assembled in Vienna, proceeded to knock to pieces the Kingdom of Italy as constituted by the Corsican conqueror, and make a new arrangement of the Italian map. The best way to appease the revolutionary spirit which was then seething in every former principality of the peninsula, it appeared to these pseudo Solomons, was to restore the status quo before Bonaparte, and divide the country up nearly as it was in the days when every principality and every republic was in a state of chronic or intermittent war with its neighbor. The King of Sardinia, an irreclaimable plotter against the peace of Italy, was recalled, and had Genoa added to his dominions, with the same vain hope of appeasing his land-hunger as when a bone is thrown to a wolf. The Bourbons were restored to the kingdom whence they were ousted by Murat; Austria grabbed at Lombardy and Venetia for herself, and the duchies were rehabilitated much in their old shape. Such measures were thought likely to satisfy the aspirations of the various revolutionists, whose unrest was thought to be provincial rather than national. These petty governments found it necessary to begin their new career with a system of repression more rigorous than that of Bonaparte, and the usual result ensued. The numbers and modes of conspiracy became multiplied; clever manipulators like Mazzini went about sowing the seed of the dragon; more coercion was applied by the stupid rulers, and the attention of the world was called to the miserable scene by the writings of men like Silvio Pellico and Guerazzi.

The part which England—or at least many leading Englishmen—took in the campaign of calumny which resulted from this propaganda is especially discreditable because all Europe knew at that time that the gentle Pope, Pius VII., was persecuted by Napoleon, whose prisoner he was, chiefly because of the firm attitude he maintained toward his design to promote a continental league against Great Britain. The Sovereign Pontiff, as spiritual father of all

nations, could not declare war against any of his family, and Napoleon's proposal virtually involved such action. If the common herd were not all aware of this, statesmen and scholars and public men, such as moulded public opinion either by their writings or public addresses, were well aware of it; and yet many such responsible persons were found at the head of the agitation whose central object was the hounding of the Papacy and the destruction of its temporal rule. Well they knew, these English public men, that political assassination was one of the means looked to by the Italian associations for the regeneration of Italy. Palmerston was aware of it—and he was at the head of the Government; Gladstone was aware of it, and he, too, was in the Government; Stansfeld, Roebuck and several others prominent in Parliamentary life, hesitated not to countenance principles so dramatically denounced by Edmund Burke when a preceding Revolution had startled the world by the enunciation of a new and monstrous doctrine in political development. Eminent men of letters began seriously to discuss the morality of murder for the public weal. In his young days Mr. Gladstone had written some worthless verses in praise of "the valiant and the good" who in their time had "clove a priest or peer in twain;" and the inclusion of the priest in the class whose fitting meed was the assassin's blow gave particular point to the circumstances of the agitation of those days. Walter Savage Landor lent all the verve and picturesqueness of an unusually fertile fancy to a glorification of the bloodbond for the removal of adversaries who might be dubbed tyrants. It may be well to reproduce some of his ardent sentences, as an example of the vein of thought running at that epoch through the British mind, and finding expression even in such staid newspapers as the *Times*. Landor write, *inter alia:*

"Public wrongs may and ought to be punished by private vindication, where the tongue of law is paralyzed by the bane of despotism; and the action which in civil life is the worst becomes, where civism lies beneath power, the most illustrious that magnanimity can achieve. The calmest and wisest men that ever lived were unanimous in this sentence; it is sanctioned by the laws of Solon, and sustained by the authority of Cicero and Aristoteles. . . . Teachers, the timid and secluded, point it out to youth among a thousand pages; colleges ring with it, over chants and homilies; piety closes her thumbed lesson, and articulates less tremulously this response. The street cries 'Cæsar,' the study whispers 'Brutus.' Degenerate men have never been so degenerate, the earth is not yet so effete, as not to rear up one imitator of one great deed. Glory to him!—peace, prosperity, long life and like descendants! Remember, brave soul, this blow fixes thy name above thy contemporaries.

Doubt not, it will have its guard to stand under it, and fill the lamp that shows thy effigy."

While the poet was thus weaving the laurel wreath for the dagger of Harmodius, the prose writer was pointing out that the time for using it had come. "Liberty," wrote the *Times*, "is to be fought for, not with fine speeches, but with knives and hatchets."

That it was not really liberty which those British dwellers in glass houses were enamored of, but a blind hatred of Pope and Papacy, is easily apparent from many passages in the higher literature of the period. Here is a specimen taken at random. It is from the *North British Review*, a shining Scottish searchlight, for May and August, 1853:

"Italia, O Italia, how long shall thy harp hang on the willows? How long instead of retaining such men as these" (anonymous conspirators) "within thy bosom, to make thee what thou mightst become, shalt thou have to drive them forth as now to show what that might be? Arise, thou noble land; arise in thy strength to right thine own wrongs, and, while righting these, to render at the same time that service to the world which the world expects from thee. Destroy that Nuisance crowned with a tiara which not thou alone but a whole earth is tired of; crush, crush that Spider of the nations whose home-nest is in thee, but whose web overspreads the world! Arise, and take thy place among the nations, O fair Italy; do among them as thou hast capacity and will; and be estimated according to thy deserts!"

If we would get the just historical perspective in our survey of sequential things, we must study for a little the background against which the figure of Francesco Crispi, the greatest statesman of "United Italy," was first projected on the political stage. He was the last of the quartette of sinister renown whose names are sculptured on the blood-red granite pillar that marks its rise on the field of history. In himself he comprised in a singular degree all the different qualities of the other three. He was a mixture of the statesman Cavour, in his profound dissembling mind; the wily conspirator Mazzini, in his readiness to adapt himself to any and every condition to gain his ends; of the impetuous and sensual Garibaldi, in his proneness to get into a fight for fighting's sake; and whatever the others lacked in downright rascality and hardihood in brazening it out on discovery was more than made up in him.

This is not our verdict upon the departed revolutionist. It is the exegesis of the various pronouncements on his career by the leading public journals of Europe. To an unholy cause he brought the service of an unholy life.

From Silvio Pellico to Francesco Crispi is a descent indeed. The

prisoner of the Austrians was no less sincere in his religion than in his patriotism. Even in his hours of greatest mental and physical anguish, as he lay helpless in his dungeon, the faith in which he had been nurtured stood firm. Those who have read his prison life will recall with what indignation he speaks of one who had wormed himself into his confidence by means of letters smuggled through a friendly jailor, and at last disclosed his intention to convert him to his own base atheism. From that moment the friendship was rejected, and the poet prisoner was content with his solitude, preferring it to contact with a designing tempter. His mind on this point speaks clearly and nobly in his tragedy of *Gismonda da Mendrisio*, wherein he makes one of the characters (Ermano) say, in answer to one who would ensnare him into treacherous action:

> The high deeds of war
> Are virtuous only when the cause is so.
> In him who is the champion of treason
> I hate, I brand them with the name of crimes.

What a delightful glimpse of character is afforded in Pellico's chapters on the deaf and dumb boy whom he found in the prison of St. Marguerite! It reads like a sweet idyll, composed in a sylvan dell or noble forest, rather than the reflections of a man cooped up in a gloomy fortress, with no prospect before his eyes but the forbidding quadrangle of the courtyard. The poor mute's affections were easily gained. Pellico shared his bread with him, and the poor child, unaccustomed to kindness—for he was a mere waif, an outcast—at once turned to his new-found friend with all the prodigal affection of a canine for his master. "Though expecting nothing from me," he says, "he would continue to gambol beneath my window, and with the most amiable grace, delighted that I should see him. One day a turnkey promised that he should be allowed to visit me in my cell; the moment he entered he ran to embrace my knees with a cry of joy. I took him in my arms, and the transports with which he caressed me are indescribable. What attachment there was in this poor creature! How I longed to educate him, to save him from the abject condition in which I found him! I never learned his name. He himself did not know that he had one. He was always gay, and never did I see him weep but once, when he was beaten, I know not for what, by the gaoler. To live in a prison seems the height of misfortune, and yet assuredly this child was then as happy as the son of a prince. I reflected on this; I learned that it is possible to render the mind independent of place. Let us keep the imagination in subjection, and we shall be well everywhere."

What a touching example of the philosophy which wrote

> Stone walls do not a prison make,
> Nor iron bars a cage.
> Minds innocent and quiet take
> These for a hermitage.

This ray of light in the two poor prisoners' lives was soon shut off. Pellico was transferred to another room, where he could see nothing, only a corner of the courtyard, and he never learned the fate of his affectionate little protégé. We can readily imagine what anguish must have torn that tender little heart at this cruel separation. Hardly more tragically pathetic is the story of Ugolino and his children in the tower than this glimpse of prison life in St. Marguerite.

The deeply religious tone of Pellico's life is further revealed in what he goes on to tell of the succeeding days. Shut off from the sight of all things outside, he was happily afforded some distraction for his mind in the sharpness of his sense of hearing. The portion of the prison set apart for female offenders was nigh, and he could hear the women talking, scolding, laughing and, sometimes, singing. He tells us that amongst those voices there was one that especially attracted him by the sweetness of its quality, and the favorite refrain of the singer:

Che rende alla meschina
La sua felicita?

Often the others joined in the refrain, and sometimes all sang the Litany. Pellico tells of the delight with which he listened to this girl's warbling, and how without seeing the owner of the voice he had come to form an attachment for her. He was destined never to behold her, for he was soon afterwards taken to Venice, to be lodged in the terrible quarters known as the *piombi.*

In his earlier years Pellico had been careless about religion, but immediately after his imprisonment began his thoughts instinctively turned toward the lessons he had learned in his childhood. When he thought of his parents and the anguish they must feel over his incarceration, he consoled himself, he tells us, by thinking of the overruling God and the comfort which stricken hearts derive by appealing to His mercy. Rigorous though his detention was, his jailors still allowed him the use of two books—the Bible and Dante. While the latter afforded him much intellectual pleasure at first, the constant repetition of its lines, which he had soon committed completely to memory, began in time to make the work pall upon him. Not so, however, with the inspired volume. He began to meditate upon its eternal truths with greater intent than ever; its salutary mandates and maxims began to impress themselves with irresistible force upon his memory. The wholesome precept, "Pray without ceasing," in especial, commended itself so to his understanding that by its help he gradually grew accustomed to the consciousness of an ever-present Deity, and to conform all his thoughts to the Divine will, in so far as he was enabled to realize what its direction

was. This habit grew upon him so that he could not emancipate himself from it, even if he so desired. It superinduced a tranquility of spirit, a gentleness of thought, a mansuetude and a magnanimity which seemed hardly short of saintly, and which, glowing through his pages, impress all readers with the idea of a truly noble being, elevating suffering into dignity and suffusing even a dungeon with the softened brilliancy of genius devoted to the service of humanity.

Such was Silvio Pellico: a man never moulded for a conspirator, yet drawn into the fatal whirlpool of conspiracy by an irresistible influence, at a time when conspiracy was epidemic. The exact antithesis of this gentle rebel was the man who, hoary but not venerable, was borne to his grave a little while ago.

If ever there lived an individual who could be described as embodying two different persons in the one psychology, the man Francesco Crispi was surely he. Although Palermo was his birthplace, he was of Albanian blood—an evil strain, for the Albanians are the descendants of renegade Christians, who, to save their lives or lands, renounced their religion and adopted that of their Moslem conquerors, and so brought disgrace upon the country of Scanderbeg and his gallant compatriots. Renegades though they be, the Albanians are valiant to ferocity, and this quality was possessed by Crispi in its intensest shape. To this high physical courage he united all that Sicilian cunning which makes the secret bond of the Mafia an *imperium in imperio* which no earthly power seems capable of suppressing or destroying. The Mafia was long in existence when Crispi began his career in Palermo, and it is there still. It is extremely probable that Crispi was, in his teens, a prominent member of this peculiar organization. The origin of the Mafia is obscure, but in all probability it was the result of the successive invasions by which Sicily was scourged, ever since the dawn of history—since it is a well-known law in human nature that deceit and lying, the only alternatives left to people between two fires, so to speak—between the fury of the invaders and the vengeance of their own fellows if they aid them—become part and parcel of the mental fibre and a hereditament that no moral training may entirely overcome. Mr. F. Marion Crawford, in his work entitled "The Rulers of the South," presents us with a good picture of what a gentleman of the Mafia looks like and represents. He quotes from the report of Signor Antonio Cutrera, the chief of police in the city of Palermo. He is describing a low Mafiusian:

"He wears his hat upon the left side, his hair smoothed with plentiful pomatum and one lock brushed down upon his forehead; he walks with a swinging motion of the hips, a cigar in his mouth, a

heavy knotted stick in his hand, and he is frequently armed with a long knife or revolver. He stares disdainfully at every man he meets with the air of challenging every comer if he dare. To any one who knows Palermo this type of the lower class is familiar. He is the common 'Riccotaro,' a word which I will not translate, but which broadly indicates that the young man derives his means of support from some unfortunate woman who is in his power. It is a deplorable fact that the same mode of existence is followed by young men of the middle classes, whose plentiful leisure hours are spent in play, and who have constituted themselves the official claque of the theatres, imposing themselves upon the managers as a compact body. Moreover, during elections they can be of the utmost assistance to candidates, owing to their perfect solidarity. With the most atrocious vices they possess the hereditary courage of the Sicilian, and will face steel or bullets with the coolness of trained soldiers; and though they will insult and even beat their women when in the humor, they will draw the knife for the least disparaging word spoken against what they regard as their property."

Palermo is the chief home of the Mafia. It is impossible to say whether Francesco Crispi was really initiated into this terrible cult or not. But, from the universality of the system, and the impossibility of any one getting along in the world without its influence, as in American cities where the "machine" is indispensable in political life, it is extremely probable that he was an influential member of it—a capo-Mafia in a short time—that is, an acknowledged leader. Although he was brought up to the profession of the law, he may still have been a member, for, as Signor Cutrera says, "the capo-Mafia may be a lawyer and a member of the muncipal or even the provincial council, or a deputy, or a cabinet minister, rising to the moral control of the whole society simply by his prestige and predominant will." We might almost think that this shrewd police official actually had Francesco Crispi in his mind's eye when penning this sketch of the Mafia organization, since if ever there was a man who possessed a predominant will, and soon, by means of it, acquired prestige and power over his fellows, Crispi was his name. It is, therefore, almost morally certain that he was a member of the Mafia, and there is no doubt whatever that he belonged to the still more formidable society of the Carbonari. The year of revolutions, 1848, found him at the head of an insurrection in Palermo, and after a period of anarchy called republican government, in which many respectable men were put to death by the mob, he is found in flight from the city, in common with other ringleaders, and a wandering outcast in several European cities. Like many other penniless

patriots he turned at last toward Turin, then the capital of the peripatetic government of Savoy, but he found little opening for his talents there. He belonged to the party of Mazzini, and as Cavour, who found it politic to disavow Mazzini and his methods, was firmly in power there, Francesco Crispi had no chance of a political job. Neither could he find any employment as a lawyer, for the market was glutted with the briefless ones. He was in sore straits—so sore, indeed, that he applied for a very modest post, a mere village berth as town clerk, at a salary of a hundred and forty dollars a year, and did not even get it. As there was nothing but starvation facing him in Piedmont, Crispi shook the dust of the country from his sandals and hied him off secretly, somehow, back to Sicily. There he again began the work of conspiracy, in agreement with Garibaldi, with whom he had formed a political connection. All the plans having been carefully laid, Garibaldi, in company with Bixio, Turr and other officers, and with the connivance of the Turin Government, it would seem, set out to attack Sicily. The expedition must certainly have been a failure were it not for the resources in villainy possessed by Crispi and Turr. The former forged a telegram which was sent on to Garibaldi, purporting to emanate from political leaders in Sicily, and announcing that all was in readiness for an uprising in the provinces as well as Palermo; whereas the fact was the very reverse, and Crispi saw that all must be lost unless Garibaldi and his filibusters appeared on the scene in a position to fight. Turr's duplicity was equally daring. He himself afterwards told it to Mr. Haweis. When Garibaldi was about to start he found to his dismay that supplies of ammunition which had been promised him by the government had not come. In this strait he sent General Turr to the commandant of the arsenal at Ortebello to endeavor to get what he wanted by any strategem possible. Turr told the commandant a bold lie to the effect that he had the King's permission to get the ammunition. He succeeded, by additional lies, in inducing the officer to hand over the supplies. The expedition was successful; and it is worth while to reproduce Turr's own story of what ensued in order to understand the double-dealing of Victor Emmanuel and his Ministers, and the discreditable connection that existed between these lofty personages and the cutthroats who accompanied the hero of the red shirt:

"Passing through Turin, I heard that the commandant of the fortress of Ortebello had been arrested and shut up in the fortress of Alessandria. I instantly went to His Majesty King Victor Emmanuel, and said to him: 'If any one deserved imprisonment it was myself, for it was I who led the commandant into error, making him believe that we were acting under your Majesty's orders.' The

King said, with one of his short laughs: 'Perfectly true; I have got to square accounts with you, for you have robbed me of one of my fortresses.' But I answered: 'We have given your Majesty the crown of Sicily, and presently will follow the crown of Naples!'

"The King promised with a smile that no harm should come to the commandant. He then told me to speak to the War Minister, General Fanti. To him I gave an accurate description of the way we had got the ammunition, and I obtained from him the assurance that no proceedings whatever should be taken against General Giorgini."

Once again the revolution was installed in power in Sicily, and Garibaldi put Crispi at the head of the temporary government there, as a reward for his valuable assistance. He was too radical, however, even for radicals, and he turned not only the conservative party but the moderates as well against him by his arbitrary behavior. He was thus early beginning that gradual process of metamorphosis whose finish was to behold the conversion of a red republican of the most uncompromising type turned into an out-and-out supporter of monarchy and a foe to all those secret associations whose help had been found so valuable in the realization of his daring ambitions. As long as Cavour lived he kept at a distance, but a little while after his death he boldly threw off the mask of republicanism and professed himself an adherent of the house of Piedmont. "The monarchy unites us," he said; "the republic would divide us." His brother in arms, Garibaldi, practically did the same when he accepted a pension from the King. We may smile at their tergiversation and their duplicity, but were they any worse than what we beheld in the case of Victor Emmanuel and his subtle Minister, the profound Cavour?

It is not our purpose to follow the career of this curious political adventurer, even in a cursory way, only to draw from its more salient phases the lessons of hypocrisy and fraud by means of which the outside world was imposed upon regarding the real nature of the Italian designs upon the Papacy and the perfidy which attended their realization. The man's life was a succession of conspiracies. When there were no longer any Bourbons to conspire against he conspired against the Moderate party with the help of the Reds; and when he joined the Monarchists he spent the remainder of his life in conspiracies against the power of the Reds. His bitterest enemies, for years, were the two men with whose help he scrambled to power —Mazzini and Garibaldi—and the wonder is how he escaped the fate of those disciples of the dagger who retire from business or turn against their companions in guilt. There is no doubt that he ran great risks and was the recipient of many threatening letters, and at

least on one occasion a serious attempt was made upon his life. But the proverbial longevity of threatened men was vividly realized in his case, and it would seem that the length of years vouchsafed him was a providential opportunity afforded him to repent of an evil career and turn toward a merciful Redeemer, only to be contemned and thrown away. Crispi's inordinate egotism it was, seemingly, that prevented him from repenting of his exceptionally sinful life. He believed he was born to be a leader of men, and so it was that when he was called on to take a place in the Italian Cabinet for the first time it was no easy matter to get him to work in harness. It may be said that all great men have had a strong sense of their own importance, but that fact does not make it a converse truth that all men of excessive vanity are entitled to be regarded as great. Richelieu was a vain man who was truly great, for he saved and reorganized his country. Crispi, on the other hand, brought his country to the verge of ruin, and brought disgrace upon himself, and with all this stolidly preserved his egotism to the last.

Next to this unconquerable personal defect, the trait which predominated most with Crispi was a fanatical anti-clericalism. Most of the men who ranged themselves under Garibaldi's banner had a tiger hatred of Church and Pope and priest, yet it might not be the truth to describe them all as atheists. But Crispi differed in nothing from an atheist. Long association with men of murder and intrigue had obliterated every trace of that religious instruction he had imbibed in his childhood. In his old age he manifested some tendencies toward a reconciliation with the Papacy, but this was only a deceptive move, made to cover some hidden purpose which never came to light, because a storm was then brewing which was destined to hurl the intriguer to irretrievable ruin. It was shortly before the Roman Bank scandal. Possibly Crispi had an instinctive sense of the danger which was looming in the immediate future, and he may have dreamed that an arrangement with the Holy See, if such could be effected, might be the only possible way of safety for him when his gigantic malfeasances must inevitably be brought to light.

Looking back now, over the chasm of half a century, it must be evident that were it not for the counsels of the violent party the destiny of Italy might have beeen peaceably arranged and a grand dream of the ages realized in the formation of a new and majestic empire in the form of a confederation of all the Italian States with the Papacy as the centre and bond of unity.

When the illustrious Pontiff Pius IX. acceded to the Chair of Peter, he was hailed by Europe and America as the saviour of the situation in the distracted Italian peninsula. "The man of the age," as he was styled, was known to be fully in accord with the national

aspirations of the Italian people and with the object of uplifting the masses from the feudal slough and the clinging weeds of a worn-out system. His fame as a reformer had been so noised abroad, his personal character had been so widely eulogized, that the highest hopes of a new era for Italy under his glorious reign found universal expression. Meetings with this object were held in the chief capitals, amongst others in New York. In the address thereat adopted, the Pope was described as one who had succeeded in uniting revolution with prescription, progress with stability and the energy of youth with the majesty of immemorial antiquity. The dream of the new Pontiff, as revealed in word and act, was truly ethereal. He deemed it possible to inaugurate a new era, wherein love would be the soul of the State and kindness the only force that would be necessary to compel obedience to law. He stemmed the torrent of revolution which he found raging at his feet by issuing, in opposition to the advice of his Council, the decree of amnesty headed "Proprio Motu." By virtue of this decree all those who had been imprisoned for political offenses in the preceding Pontificate, as well as all those who had been exiled or disqualified, were set free on their own bond to behave as orderly and dutiful citizens in the future. This totally unexpected act of generosity threw Rome into a frenzy of joy, and the Pope was everywhere hailed as the ideal ruler and Pontiff. But these golden opinions of a fickle populace proved to be ephemeral. Artful and treacherous men abounded, violent men upon whom all gentleness was wasted—men of whom Gioberti may be taken as type in subtlety of guile and disloyalty of action. Gioberti is to many minds even yet a mystery, so inconsistent had been his action when in power in Sardinia with his professions and his theories regarding the Sovereign Pontiff and the place of the Holy See in the governmental orrery. While denying that civil society had the right to emancipate itself from ecclesiastical supremacy by means of violence, he was yet surrounded by a crowd of enthusiasts of the school of Young Italy—Mazzinians and leaders of other revolutionary circles, all bent upon overthrowing the Papacy and making the Democracy the masters of the Pope and the real rulers of the Papal Court. All this double-dealing was sugared over with the coating of a philosophy so plausible as to remain to the present hour a source of perplexity to the most experienced in dialectics as to its real character. It is difficult to decide, when all things are weighed, whether the Papacy has not more reason to dread the influence of men like Gioberti, with their fair exterior, than the undisguised enmity of profligates like Crispi.

It is something like the converse of Dante's progress through the hidden world when one seeks to follow the circles of development in

Italian unification. The climbing is not upward. The movement which began in romance and pathetic biography grew into the semblance of philosophy, and the endeavor to crystallize the philosophy into action as a working system proved it to be empiric, so direful have been its results. Philosophy and conspiracy are impracticable yoke-fellows. When we survey Crispi, the typical embodiment of this pseudo-philosophy, in his character as it stands stripped by the unsparing hand of history, it is possible to imagine how the novel of "Frankenstein" may have been a prophetic prefigurement of the outcome of Italy's political travail in those days of agony.

While the whole American nation is quivering under the blow of an assassin, it is useful to recall that its press had nothing but regret when the news of Crispi's demise came, and Crispi was of the cult of political assassination, and it was by the help of assassins he climbed to fame and opulence. In the house of an English resident named Pearse, in Palermo, masquerading as a commercial personage, he superintended the manufacture of bombs for the destruction of the Sardinian monarch's supporters, and showed his companions how to use them. This fact he used to speak of himself. He was one of those arrested in Paris in connection with Orisini's plot to blow up Louis Napoleon, but as he was careful to destroy all letters referring to such things, according to an understanding with Mazzini, the police were unable to connect him with the outrage when it was perpetrated. His signature was openly affixed to a proclamation offering, on the part of the revolutionary government in Sicily, a reward of ten thousand ducats for the assassination of King Ferdinand, declaring that political homicide is no crime. Is it to be wondered at that such lessons bore fruit in time? When the apt scholars to whom they were addressed turned them to account against the teachers themselves, they did but apply the principles of Mazzini's philosophy to the conditions which had most immediate concern for themselves. Victor Emmanuel made a pact with assassination when he condoned the filibustering raids of Garibaldi on Sicily and the States of the Church; and when Garibaldi's lieutenant, Crispi, became a renegade to the Revolution and espoused the cause of the Monarchy, nothing could be more of course than the application of the methods of the Revolution to the situation thus created. Automatically, so to speak, the machinery of the *accoltelatori*, began to work, and if Crispi contrived to escape the fate that overtook King Humbert, it was not because he was less the object of vengeance than the doomed son of Victor Emmanuel.

Why is it, when men are casting about for reasons why anarchy is synonymous with murder, that the true genesis of the dread monster is not traced? No story is simpler, if those who profess to be

in search of it will only read what is written. The principles of anarchy are old, but the practical adaptation of them to modern conditions is so interwoven with the story of United Italy as to be inseparable. It was under the shelter of England that the horrid incubation was made a success. Crispi was the example of anarchy successful in seeking rehabilitation as applied philosophy.

Hatred of the Papacy did not mean merely, in the case of Crispi and his associate Garibaldi, hatred of it as a politico-religious system. It meant a passionate fury against the whole religious idea, and especially against the Catholic idea. This rabies is strikingly illustrated in the history of the Bruno incident. Herein is a point upon which Crispi's admirers in the English-speaking secular press are singularly silent. That press would fain pose as respectable in its attitude toward religion. Therefore, in its survey of Crispi's career, the Bruno incident was allowed to drop out of sight. Was this silence that of charity, or was it prompted by the same motive which slurred over Crispi's connection with the men of the dagger and the hand grenade?

Crispi, if he had any notions of religion at all, appears to have some leanings toward the pantheism of the "Naturalists." At all events he believed that Christianity, if it ever had any useful purpose in the modern dispensation, was played out, and must be abolished if the car of civilization were not to be impeded in its beneficent progress. The struggle between civilization and Christianity, he declared through his mouthpiece, Signor Bovio, had been going on for fifteen centuries, and the day of victory for the former had dawned with the inauguration of the Bruno memorial. The philosophy of Nature was to take the place of the philosophy of Christ; there were to be thenceforth nor priesthood, nor creed, nor temple; the Church of the Universe, into which all men should freely enter, was to take the place of the Catholic Church which has Rome for its centre, and no man evermore should be excommunicated for holding any doctrine or holding no doctrine at all. These were Crispi's religious sentiments, as interpreted by his friend, Bovio. They are Shelley's without the poetical envelope—and Shelley got the burial of an atheist and a heretic.

If there was a woful decline from the beginnings of New Italy to its consummation, in the matter of religious faith, not less conspicuous was the contrast presented with regard to private morality. Men who spurn God have usually little squeamishness about spurning social canons. Garibaldi and Crispi were notoriously profligates in their private lives. In the case of Garibaldi this fact might not have mattered much, so far as his relation to politics was concerned. But in Crispi's position it became a consideration of some consequence.

He was thrust into prominence wherein social standing and behavior was an element that could not but count for something, and his shameful connections affected his own fortunes and brought menace and discredit to the country which he professed to serve with a patriot fervor.

The basest of profligates who live upon the wages of sin could not have eclipsed the statesman who is called great in his ingratitude toward the victims whom he made his providers. In this respect there was a striking resemblance between Garibaldi and Crispi. Still, Garibaldi was not guilty of the baseness of deserting the woman who followed him as a faithful dog, after she had deserted her lawful husband; they clung to each other until he was a fugitive outcast, and she died in the woods near Ravenna, and he left some directions when dying that showed he cherished her memory. But not so with Crispi. The woman whom he married on the second occasion, and who roughed it with him in all his campaigning in the field and conspiring in the wineshop, he basely deserted when his fortunes brightened, and secretly married another. This scandal was too much. The Queen, it was said, stirred Crispi's parliamentary enemy, Nicotera, to take action in the matter; he attacked him in his paper, the *Bersagliere*, and so palpable was the case that there was nothing for it but to set the law in motion against the hardened offender. Crispi was prosecuted for bigamy, although in reality his offense was more, and he got out of the scrape by the following specimen of Italian legal finesse: "When Signor Crispi married for the third time, his first wife was dead; his second marriage was illegal, because it was contracted during the first wife's lifetime; his third marriage, therefore, is legal." This third marriage proved his undoing. His third wife was an ambitious, robust-minded female. Her influence on his fortunes is thus sketched by the late Mr. Stillman, the intimate personal friend of Crispi and Roman correspondent of the London *Times:*

> At the receptions of the Queen, Signora Crispi, who was really an antipathetic person, had her seat in the Royal circle, where she sat as completely ignored by all present as if she were a statue of Aversion. I am convinced that the larger part of animosity shown for Crispi by the better classes in Rome was due to her. On one occasion I heard General —— (one of the Thousand) saying to another person: "Poor Crispi, he has not a friend in the world." "Nonsense, he has thousands of friends," replied the other. "No," returned the General, "if Crispi had one friend he would kill that woman." . . . .

Signora Crispi had more than ambition; she had a great itching for money, like most other ambitious people; and Crispi, the master of men, in some unaccountable way, became the slave of this grasping, designing woman. For her sake he plunged his hands into the coffers of the Banca Romana, and the connection of himself and his interesting family, the relatives and hangers-on of Donna Lina, with

that bank and with several other banking institutions, from the time of his third marriage until his disgrace and downfall, was that of the blackmailer and his victim.

Of Crispi's niche in the Valhalla of great statesmen it is not necessary here to speak. If statesmanship consists in bringing one's country to bankruptcy by means of crushing military burdens, the outcome of foreign alliances, then indeed Crispi was a phenomenal success, since the drain of the Triple Alliance in manhood and treasure, as far as Italy is concerned, has been incessant, relentless and utterly barren of good. The overwhelming military disaster at Adowah stands on record as a monument of his maladroit genius in the field of colonial compensations. To "scatter plenty o'er a smiling land" was not Crispi's idea of a great Minister's function, but rather to squeeze a poverty-stricken, resourceless land to the last point of human endurance; and this he continued to do until he was at last forced to yield up his office in utter ignominy.

What is the political and social condition of the Italy which Crispi and his policy have created? Professor Fiammingo, in the *Contemporary Review* (September, 1900) gave the world a glimpse. He declares that "everywhere in Italy there is profound discontent and dissatisfaction with a government which extracts two-fifths of the whole earnings of the country in taxation. There is not an Italian," he adds, "who does not attribute the terrible and profound financial calamities of his country to the mistaken action of the government, and the chorus of condemnation against this government, which appears to be doing its best to impoverish thirty-five millions of inhabitants, and to restrict in every possible way their personal liberty, is every day becoming more pronounced, and almost threatening in its intensity. It is difficult now to meet a young Italian of a certain degree of culture who does not style himself a 'literary Anarchist,' or at least a 'Marxian Socialist.' "

Professor Fiammingo does not hesitate to say that brigandage is a secular institution in his country; that there is no other nation with such a criminal record. It has twenty murders for every one committed in England. There were a hundred and fifty regicides during the past century, and two-thirds of these were the work of Italians. It is the curse of militarism which seems to be making brigandage, and famine, too, "secular institutions." In the *Monthly Review* of last July a writer named Edward C. Strutt, in the course of a paper on "Famine in Italy and Its Causes," gives some terribly suggestive details of the effect of the military system on the peasantry. In Sardinia in twelve years and a half, he testifies, no fewer than 52,060 judicial sales of houses and lands took place for nonpayment of taxes, or one out of every fourteen inhabitants was

despoiled by government. Out of 445 such sales in the first week of the new century, eighty-five per cent. were for sums less than one lira (10d.) each. Sometimes the amount is as small as five centimes (½d.)! Mr. Strutt remarks on the paradox that just "those regions which have been more plentifully endowed with natural wealth, such as Sardinia, Sicily, Calabria and Apulia, are those which now suffer most cruelly." The writer says it would be difficult to find a people more frugal or more easily satisfied than the Pugliese peasantry; and yet, olive-blight, insurrection and savage repression have left them in despair. Life in gaol appears a paradise to the starving, to attain which innumerable crimes are committed where crime was formerly unknown.

No government in the world ever was the target for such vituperation as that of the Papal States prior to the Italian occupation. Corruption and incompetency were said to be its perennial characteristics as a political system, while the condition of the people, appressed by taxation and grovelling in helpless ignorance, was depicted as the most forlorn and wretched of all European populations. English travelers gave out such tales year after year, while the other side of the picture was as carefully kept from the public vision as the farther hemisphere of the moon. Let us see how the real state of affairs in the Papal territories compared with the conditions of modern Italy as evolved by Depretis and Crispi. Happily we have some data on which we can rely, supplied from a most impartial source. The Count de Tournon, who was appointed by Napoleon, acted as Prefect of Rome and Administrator of the Papal States for the four years from 1810 to 1814. He is described, even by a British authority, as one of those highly intelligent and honorable men whom the conqueror sometimes sent to the countries he had occupied as if to make them some compensation for the evils of military conquest. He has left us a book of the most valuable character, composed with that rare combination of scientific precision and sympathetic observation which makes French descriptive literature so much prized by those in search of style as well as fact. Tournon gives in the most unreserved and unvarnished way a history of the frightful evils caused by the French invasions and the successive abductions of the Popes by the imperious conqueror. He does not spare the French generals who emulated their master in the work of pillage and oppression; and it may well be surmised that it was a fortunate circumstance for the author that the overthrow of Waterloo had taken place before his book was ready for the press, else he must have been made pay the penalty of his candor. He cannot be suspected by any one of any kind of bias in the matter. He was incessantly on the wing throughout the territory, while fulfilling his

trust, observing methods of agriculture, taking statistics of births, marriages and mortality, measuring farms and compiling tables of cost and profit on all kinds of products—making, in fact, a most exhaustive study of Italy's economic state, in the manner of Adam Smith.

The banditti were the great trouble of De Tournon's administration. These gentry had largely increased owing to the French occupation, and De Tournon frankly lays the blame for a large portion of the trouble at the door of the French administration of Rome and Naples. By dismissing the local police, or *sbirri*, the French authorities had thrown so many semi-military men on the world without employment, and these could find nothing to live by save the profession in whose extinction they themselves had formerly been most engaged. These banditti were gradually decimated until, at the close of the French occupation their number was reduced to about fifty. The state of Rome at this time is thus depicted:

"Eight commissioners of police, with a small municipal guard, maintained the city in perfect safety. The lighting of the streets, a measure then introduced into most Italian cities, contributed to the public security. . . . The influence of the parochial clergy and the respectable part of the country people assisted the governmnet in the work of reformation. The peasants and villagers, now sure of protection, understood that it was their interest to aid the magistrates and police in arresting malefactors, a thing they would have spurned before. By these means," the writer concludes, "it was proved that the Roman people could be soon raised to a very high degree in the scale of morality and rendered as humane, mild and orderly as their neighbors of Tuscany. Indeed, there is nothing in the dispositions of the modern Romans opposed to this assumption; they are full of intelligence, having a strong feeling of self-respect; and, although prone to anger under provocation, they are in the common relations of life gentle, benevolent and warm-hearted, and particularly expressive of their gratitude."

This was the state of a peasantry just recovering from the wrongs and alarms of war and the brutal license of an invading army, it must be remembered. Concerning the criminal statistics of the time, De Tournon gives some remarkable figures. In the two years from August, 1811, to September, 1813, there were 2,072 persons tried for offenses in Rome, being at the rate of one to every 1,000 yearly. Another writer had asserted that there were 10,000 criminal cases yearly in the Roman courts, and De Tournon seemed to feel it his duty to remove this false impression of the criminality of the Roman States. Again, the prisons of Rome, he declares, were better than in most other towns of Europe. Charitable societies,

confraternite, supply the indigent prisoners with food and raiment, and are a useful check on the avarice or tyranny of jailors. Regarding the much-maligned Inquisition, or Holy Office, in Rome, this is what the author has to say:

"When the French took possession of Rome they found the prison of the Inquisition nearly empty—(it had been so for many years before)—and nothing in the regulations or internal arrangements of the house showed that it had been the scene of any act of cruelty; on the contrary, the comfortable size of the apartments intended for the prisoners, their airiness and cleanliness, bespoke the humanity of those who presided over the establishment. It may be asserted that the Holy Office in Rome is nothing more than an ecclesiastical tribunal to check any misconduct of the clergy themselves."

The hospitals and benevolent institutions in Rome at this time are minutely described and enthusiastically dwelt upon by De Tournon. They sheltered, when the French entered the city 3,500 helpless beings. He states their income thus:

	Francs.		Francs.
Rent of lands	331,399	Various receipts, donations, etc.	95,622
Rent of houses	230,390	Produce of labor of inmates	22,000
Mortgage, fees, etc.	169,989	Credits on the State	332,000

The population of the city, at that period, owing to the absence of the Popes and the French invasion, had dwindled down to 123,000.

Concerning the so-called tyrannical sway of the Papacy, the author gives some very remarkable illustrations of the fallacy. For instance, he says:

"There is a congregation called *del Buon Governo*, which is independent of Ministers; it is presided over by a Cardinal Prefect, and composed of Cardinals and prelates; it superintends the communal administrations, watches the interests of the communes, and often takes their part against the pretensions of government—a very remarkable institution," he remarks, "under an absolute government." A very liberal system throughout, indeed, seems to have been this "absolute government" of the Papal States. "The towns and villages have each a municipal council. . . . The members are taken in equal proportions from the nobles and from the citizens and farmers. . . . The council discusses the wants and the means of the commune, and makes out the yearly budget, which is sent to the delegate of the province for approval. The council fixes the rates to be paid, superintends the expenditure and audits the accounts. It appoints the servants of the commune, pays the local police, the schoolmaster, the apothecary and surgeon, who receive a fixed remuneration, and are obliged to attend gratis all the poor inhabitants. This system of municipal administration," goes

on De Tournon, "will surprise those who imagine that in the Papal States everything is left to the will or caprice of the government. Abuses of power are common, no doubt, but the written law is more favorable to the liberties of the people than is commonly supposed."

We could quote much more to show that for many years before the system of local government had been created in England the rule which she forty years later had been denouncing as a barbarous anachronism had set it up throughout the territory known as the States of the Church; and, furthermore, that the people under it were infinitely better off, in a material as well as a moral sense, than the bulk of the Italian population under the sway of United Italy. So much for the statesmanship of Francesco Crispi.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Scientific Chronicle.

BRITISH CONGRESS ON TUBERCULOSIS.

The success of medical science in combating disease depends largely, as is evident, on a knowledge of the causes producing the malady, while preventive medical science is effective in holding it in check only when intelligently directed at the root of the evil. Hope of relief, as far as human means can bring it, is held out in the case of many of the ills that flesh is heir to, for medical science has determined with great accuracy the source whence they spring and is able to point out with precision the best method of prevention. A summary of a few important cases will be of interest. These are recalled by Dr. Koch in his address to the congress.

The old theory of the transmission of pestilence was that the plague patient was the centre of infection and transmitted the disease directly to other patients. On this theory the arrangements for preventing the spread of the dread bubonic plague were based. Now, however, it is known that only those patients who have plague-pneumonia are centres of infection and that the real transmitters of the plague are the rats. Hence is it that the application of anti-toxic serum and protective inoculation have had such little effect in preventing the spread of the plague. There is no longer any doubt that the spread of the plague was due to plague among the ship rats. Wherever the rats were exterminated the plague rapidly disappeared, wherever this precaution was not taken the pestilence continued.

Cholera may under certain conditions be transmitted from one human being to another, but the most dangerous propagator is water. Therefore the proper manner of fighting the disease is by preventing the use of polluted water.

An outbreak of hydrophobia is prevented in an infected person by inoculation, but this does not prevent the infection itself. This can be secured only by compulsory muzzling of all dogs.

Leprosy is a parasitic disease and is transmitted only from person to person when they come into close contact in small dwellings and bedrooms. As immediate transmission plays the important part, the way to combat the disease is to prevent the too close contact of the sick and the healthy. By isolation of the infected in leper houses during the Middle Ages the disease, which had spread to an alarming degree, was stamped out of Central Europe.

The methods suggested in the case of these diseases have proved effective; therefore we look forward to the direct method of attacking other formidable diseases at their origin as the best method of bringing relief to suffering humanity.

Keeping in view the progress that has been made in the study of the causes of diseases and the satisfactory results that have been achieved by attacking these causes, Professor Robert Koch outlined the course that he judged proper for the treatment of consumption, in an address delivered before the British Congress on Tuberculosis, on July 23 last.

From the address as it appears in the *Popular Science Monthly* for September and in *Nature* we select the following points of interest to our readers:

We know that the real cause of the disease is a parasite, that is, a visible and palpable enemy which we can pursue and annihilate, just as we can pursue and annihilate other parisitic enemies of mankind. I suppose there is hardly any medical man now who denies the parasitic nature of tuberculosis, and among the non-medical public, too, the knowledge of the nature of the disease has been widely propagated. Now we know that every disease must be treated according to its own special individuality and that the measures to be taken against it must be most accurately adapted to its special nature, to its etiology.

In by far the majority of cases of tuberculosis the disease has its seat in the lungs, and has also begun there. From this fact it is justly concluded that the germs of the disease—the tubercle bacilli—must have got into the lungs by inhalation. As to the question where the inhaled tubercle bacilli have come from there is also no doubt; on the contrary, we know with certainty that they get into the air with the sputum of consumptive patients. This sputum, especially in advanced stages of the disease, almost always contains tubercle bacilli, sometimes in incredible quantities. By coughing and even speaking it is flung into the air in little drops, that is, in a moist condition, and can at once infect persons who happen to be near the coughers. But then it may also be pulverized when dry, in the linen or on the floor, for instance, and get into the air in the form of dust. The sputum of consumptive people, then, is to be regarded as the main source of the infection of tuberculosis.

Dr. Koch then discusses the question of other sources of the disease and his conclusions are thus summed up: Great importance used to be attached to the hereditary transmission of tuberculosis. Now, however, it has been demonstrated by thorough investigation that though hereditary tuberculosis is not absolutely non-existent, it is nevertheless extremely rare, and we are at liberty, in considering

our practical measures, to leave this form of origination entirely out of account.

Genuine tuberculosis has hitherto been observed in almost all domestic animals, and most frequently in poultry and cattle. From a large number of experiments made under his own direction Dr. Koch is of opinion that bovine tuberculosis, which is the only form that has been considered dangerous to man, differs from human tuberculosis and that the latter cannot be transmitted to cattle. Important as this question is, it is far more important to know if bovine tuberculosis can be transmitted to man. Most medical men believe that it is transmitted. In attacking this question Dr. Koch referred to the fact that here direct experiment is not possible, as in the former case. The experiment is, however, made daily by millions of people, who unintentionally consume in meat and milk virulent and living bacilli of bovine tuberculosis. This being so, Dr. Koch contends that a great many cases of tuberculosis caused by the consumption of alimenta should occur among the inhabitants of large cities, especially among the children. He holds, however, that this is not the case. The Doctor contends that a case of tuberculosis caused by alimenta can be assumed with certainty only when the intestine suffers first, that is, when a so-called primary tuberculosis of the intestine is found. He cites from his own experience and from hospital records of such cases to show how few they are, and adds that it is just as likely that they were caused by the widely-propagated bacilli of human tuberculosis, which may have got into the digestive canal in some way or other, for instance, by swallowing saliva of the mouth.

Dr. Koch holds that now it is possible to determine whether the tuberculosis of the intestine is of human or animal origin. All that need be done is to inoculate cattle with a culture of the bacilli, and if it be bovine tuberculosis, they will be attacked by it; if human tuberculosis, they will not be affected. So strongly convinced is he of his view, that tuberculosis is not transmitted from cattle to man, that he does not deem it necessary to take any measures against it. This is a complete change from the original position of Dr. Koch, that bovine and human tubercle were practically identical.

This change of view aroused great interest, and as the new position can only be assailed by the production of positive evidence that bovine tuberculosis is communicable to man, it was the source of much interest to have such evidence brought forward by Dr. Ravenal, of Philadelphia. He brought forward three cases of such infection that had fallen under his observation. He stated that death had resulted in one of these cases, and in another the bovine tubercle bacillus was recovered from the local lesion. As there was doubt

cast on the position taken by Dr. Koch, it was agreed that further investigation was absolutely necessary and that the present vigilance exercised in the inspection of meat, milk and butter should not be in the least relaxed until more conclusive results were reached.

The Congress was a great success and far surpassed the expectations of the organizers. The effect of the meeting was manifest in the resolutions presented at its close. They may be thus summed up: To prevent tuberculosis it is necessary to attend to the housing of the people, to the provision of a sufficient supply of fresh air, as good nutrition as possible, and to the prevention of the dissemination of the tubercle bacillus. For this purpose proper care should be taken to have it collected and destroyed as soon as it comes from the patient. To cure consumption, fresh air, good food and well-regulated exercise are required.

ELECTRICITY AT THE PAN-AMERICAN EXPOSITION.

Probably the most interesting feature of the Buffalo Exposition, to the student of mechanical engineering, is the comparison, intentional or otherwise, of the development, transmission and utilization of power by water, gas, steam, compressed air and electricity. While all these different sources of power are well represented, it is clear that electricity had the advantage in a contest which was waged so close to the great electrical plant at Niagara Falls.

The ordinary visitor, however, is most impressed with the electrical illumination of the Grand Court. This Court covers 1,390,000 square feet and is therefore equal in extent to the like features of the Chicago and Paris Expositions combined. The grounds, buildings and electric tower are illuminated by using for that purpose 5,000 horse-power of the energy from Niagara Falls. The power generated at the Falls, by the Niagara Falls Power Company, is a two-phase alternating current of 25 cycles at 2,200 volts. It is at once transformed to a 22,000 volt three-phase current and transmitted twenty miles over copper and aluminum lines to Buffalo. At the city station, on Ontario street, the voltage is reduced to 11,000 and the current then sent about two miles to the rheostat house near one of the entrances to the Exposition grounds. In the rheostat house there are three large water rheostats, each measuring 7 feet long, 3 wide and 3 deep. Blades 6 feet long, which may be lowered into the tanks by a small direct current motor, serve to bring the lamps slowly up to full brilliancy, when metallic contact is made at the bottom of

the tanks. These resistance tanks may be operated from the Electricity Building.

From the rheostat house the current is transmitted to the transforming sub-station in the Electricity Building. At this station 18 air-blast transformers reduce the voltage of the current to 1,800. Thence the current goes to about 40 transformer-pits, scattered about the grounds, where the voltage is brought down to 104 for the incandescent lamps that are used for illuminating the grounds.

The electricity from Niagara is used chiefly for the exterior incandescent decorative lighting. The only other use made of it is the alternating current series arc lighting of the Electricity Building.

The decorative lighting of the grounds is accomplished by 800 artistically designed lamp-posts with from 12 to 26 eight candle-power incandescent lamps on the smaller ones and 59 on the larger posts. The illumination is increased by the rows of electric lamps that cluster along the prominent lines of the high structures that surround the Grand Court, and the lights on the mammoth electric tower are the culmination of a magnificent scene of exterior illumination by incandescent lamps, marking the furthest advance and most extensive application of this method of illumination.

The success of this method at Buffalo has undoubtedly settled the question for all future occasions where illumination on a large scale will be required. Heretofore a combination of arc and incandescent lights with gas-light was employed. This combination did not produce the smooth uniform illumination which is characteristic of the Pan-American. This uniform distribution of light was secured by a minute sub-division and multiplication of the units of illumination. No unit larger than an eight or a sixteen candle-power incandescent lamp was employed. These were arranged in coronet or crescent form so as to avoid massing. The only exception to this arrangement was in the Court of Fountains, where there were clusters in imitation of a flambeau. Here there was a glare of light in the line of sight which marred slightly the evenness of the illumination. In such a scheme of general illumination the eye can endure points of light of eight or sixteen candle-power. If, however, a brilliant cluster or an arc light is in the line of vision the eye is so impressed by looking at this exceptionally brilliant point that the less brilliantly lighted places seem dark and like shadows, thus destroying the evenness of the illumination. It was the avoiding in general of such intensely brilliant points by the sub-division of the illuminating units that secured the uniformly bright illumination which was so greatly admired at the Pan-American Exposition.

The size and number of the great engineering projects which, from every part of the continent, claimed a place in this Exposition, could

be satisfied only by representing them in model. Hence representation by model is a striking feature of this Exposition. Large central engines with long lines of shafting are as a rule absent from this exhibition, and as electricity is used as the driving power they are more artistically placed and conformity with the architectural design is secured.

Although we have referred in a special way to the use of electricity for lighting purposes, its application to power service is represented in more varied ways at the Exposition. Electric motors of varied styles and embodying new departures in the application of the electric current, electric pumping, both by alternating and direct current, electric elevators and hoists, electric traction, electric brakes and car-heating apparatus, electrically propelled vehicles and launches, electrically operated control for steam engines, electric train lighting, telegraph, telephone and X-ray exhibits indicate a few of the ways in which the visitor is impressed with the important part electricity plays in the service of man.

This, however, gives but a very faint idea of the immense power of electricity as shown within twenty miles of the Exposition. This growing centre of industry, made possible by converting the power of Niagara into electricity, must be regarded as a part of the exhibit. 25,000 horse-power in the form of electrical energy is used in the calcium carbide, graphite, carborundum and emery products. The electro-chemical industries use 3,600 horse-power, while the electro-metallurgical industries at present require 5,700 horse-power. Such is the growth of industries around the Falls that the Niagara Falls Power Company is at present doubling the size of its plant.

THE MOSQUITO AND YELLOW FEVER.

The mosquito has been convicted as the "intermediate host" in transmitting malaria and therefore the only way to fight the disease intelligently is to prevent the mosquito from being infected. This same vigilance must now be used in fighting yellow fever, for the report of the Havana Yellow Fever Commission shows that this same insect acts as the "intermediate host" or medium of propagating this disease.

The evidence in the case is clearly summed up in an article in the *Popular Science Monthly* by George M. Sternberg, Surgeon General U. S. A. From the reports of this committee it is evident that the

greatest care has been taken to secure only results that will stand the most severe examination.

Some extracts from the report issued from Headquarters Department, Cuba, will give a good idea of the conclusions arrived at. "So far as yellow fever is concerned, infection of a room or building simply means that it contains infected mosquitoes, that is, mosquitoes which have fed on yellow fever patients. Disinfection, therefore, means the employment of measures aimed at the destruction of these mosquitoes. The most effective of these measures is fumigation, either with sulphur, formaldehyde or insect powder. The fumes of sulphur are the quickest and most effective insecticide, but are otherwise objectionable. Formaldehyde gas is quite effective if the infected rooms are kept closed and sealed for two or three hours. The smoke of insect powder has also been proved very useful; it readily stupifies the mosquitoes, which drop to the floor and can then be readily destroyed. The washing of walls, floors, ceilings and furniture with disinfectants is unnecessary.

"As it has been demonstrated that yellow fever cannot be conveyed by fomites, such as bedding, clothing, effects and baggage, they need not be subjected to any special disinfection. Care should be taken, however, not to remove them from the infected rooms until after formaldehyde fumigation, so that they may not harbor infected mosquitoes.

"Medical officers taking care of yellow fever patients need not be isolated; they can attend other patients and associate with non-immunes with perfect safety to the garrison. Nurses and attendants taking care of yellow fever patients shall remain isolated so as to avoid any possible danger of their conveying mosquitoes from patients to non-immunes.

"The infection of mosquitoes is likely to take place during the first two or three days of the disease. It is therefore essential that all fever cases should be at once isolated and so protected that no mosquitoes can possibly get access to them until the nature of the fever is positively determined. Patients not ill enough to take to their beds and remaining unsuspected and unprotected are probably those most responsible for the spread of the disease.

"All persons coming from an infected locality to a post shall be kept under careful observation until the completion of five days from the time of possible infection, either in a special detention camp or in their own quarters; in either case their temperature should be taken twice a day during this period of observation so that those who develop yellow fever may be placed under treatment at the very inception of the disease."

From the investigations of this committee it seems evident that a

mosquito that has fed on the blood of a yellow fever patient is not dangerous at all times following its infection, but a certain period of incubation is required in the body of the insect before the germ reaches its salivary glands and consequently before it is able to inoculate an individual with the germs of yellow fever. This period is put at from ten to twelve days.

To test whether yellow fever was transmitted by fomites a special building was constructed. This building was mosquito proof and in it were placed three large boxes filled with sheets, pillow slips, blankets, etc., contaminated by contact with cases of yellow fever and their discharges were received and placed therein. On the 30th of November, 1900, Dr. R. P. Cooke and two privates of the hospital corps, all non-immunes, entered the building, opened the boxes, giving each article a thorough shaking. They then hung the articles around the room and slept in the room that night. This operation was repeated for twenty days and nights, and these non-immunes did not contract the fever. This building was afterwards occupied by other non-immunes with like results.

To complete the proof a second building was erected and every possible source of infection was removed. The building was divided into two compartments by a mosquito-proof wiring. On one side of the partition a non-immune and on the other two non-immunes were placed. In the compartment in which the one non-immune was fifteen mosquitoes which had previously fed on yellow fever patients were freed. This man was bitten by these mosquitoes. For three days he was bitten by these insects and contracted yellow fever. The two others who lived under the same conditions, minus the mosquitoes, did not contract the fever.

This brief account of some of the methods of investigation shows how thoroughly the work has been done and the value attaching to the published results.

THE NERNST ELECTRIC LAMP.

The exhibit of Nernst lamps in the Electricity Building at the Pan-American Exposition is the first public exhibit of the lamp in the United States. In experimental form it was shown at the Paris Exhibition. At the Pan-American the lamp has passed the experimental stage and is showing by actual work what it is capable of doing. In the grand dome of the Electricity Building and around the Westinghouse exhibit it produces magnificent lighting effects. The color value of the lamp is superior to that of any other electric

light. It is practically equal to sunlight in enabling one to match or detect delicate shades or tints in fabrics or other material.

The steady improvement in the Nernst lamp dates from 1898, when Dr. Nernst, the inventor, came to this country and exhibited his lamp before Mr. George Westinghouse, at Pittsburg. The latter, holding the right for the United States, engaged a number of competent electrical engineers to develop the lamp, and the present perfected lamp is the result.

The source of light in the Nernst lamp is a glowing rod of rare earths. It is made by expressing from a die a paste made of rare earths. It is cut into suitable lengths, dried and roasted. This rod of enamel measures about one and one-half inches in length and one-thirty-second of an inch in diameter. A platinum bead is imbedded in each end of the rod and to these beads the wires can be easily fused.

This glower, as it is called, is a non-conductor when cold, but becomes a conductor when heated. It is therefore necessary to heat the glower to bring it to a conducting temperature. In the first lamps the inventor did this by means of an alcohol lamp or even by a match. He also employed electric heaters. The glower is lighted at a temperature of about 950 degrees C. To secure this temperature in the present lamp the heater employed consists of a thin porcelain tube, around which a fine platinum wire is wound and pasted with cement. The paste serves to protect the wire from the intense heat of the glower. These tubes are wound for 110 volts and are connected by pairs in series according to the service required. The life of a heater when running constantly is about 200 hours. This indicates a long life in actual service, for each time the lamp is lighted the heater is used for about 30 seconds only.

As the temperature of the glower rises its conductivity increases. The voltage across the terminals of the glower also increases, at first rapidly, and then more slowly, until it reaches a maximum. Then it falls off as the current and temperature increase. This decrease after maximum is so rapid that it makes it difficult to control the current. To meet this difficulty a steadying resistance has been introduced. This consists of an iron wire mounted in a glass tube which contains some inert gas. Under normal conditions the resistance of the iron wire is a minimum, and throughout the high corrective region the wire can be worked, as there is no danger of its destruction, since oxygen is excluded. The protection this ballast gives the glower is evident, when for a ten per cent. rise in current the resistance of the ballast increases 150 per cent. In series with this regulator and the glower is the control magnet of the heater. When the current flows through the regulator and the glower it

passes through the control magnet and cuts out the heater when the lamp has been brought into service.

This lamp works with alternating currents, and when such currents are used there is no electrolytic action observable in the glower. Improvements are being made in the lamp for use with direct currents. When such currents are employed the glower acts as a true electrolyte, there being a black deposit on the negative end of the glower which rapidly extends to the positive end and reduces the efficiency of the glower. The life of the glower is, as determined by actual service, 800 hours. This is about double the life of an incandescent lamp of lowest watt consumption and of equivalent candle-power. The unit for lamps is the single 50 candle-power glower, and by multiplying the number of glowers a lamp of any desired efficiency may be had.

D. T. O'Sullivan, S. J.

Boston, Mass.

Book Notices.

INSTITUTIONES METAPHYSICAE SPECIALIS, quas tradiderat in Collegio Maximo Lovaniensi. *P. Stanislaus De Backer, S. J.* T. II., Psychologia. Pars. I., De Vita Organica. Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne & Cie., 83 Rue de Rennes. 1901, pp. 266.

INSTITUTIONES PHILOSOPHIAE MORALIS ET SOCIALIS, quas in Collegio Maximo Lovaniensi tradiderat. *A. Castelein, S. J.* Bruxelles: Schepens & Cie., 16 Rue Treurenberg, pp. 662.

There are obviously good grounds for that point of view adopted by some recent Catholic philosophers which restricts psychology to the philosophy of the human soul. This position escapes on the one hand the necessity of expending energy in the study of living organism inferior to man, and on the other hand avoids the recent mutilation of psychology which results from confining it to the classification and surface analysis of merely psychical phenomena.

There are, however, no less potent arguments in favor of that broader conception which defines psychology as the philosophy of the *soul*, taking the latter term in its widest Aristotelian sense for the root principle of life in an organism including therefore the plant and the animal. The human soul is more than the basal principle of intelligence and will. It is the source of all vital activity within the body, vegetation as well as sentience. The higher spiritual functions and hence the nature itself of the rational soul cannot be scientifically explained unless its vegetative and sentient powers and activities are understood. These, however, will be most satisfactorily explained by investigating the operations and principle of life in the plant and animal. Father De Backer has wisely, we think, accepted the peripatetic definition of psychology as the *scientia* (philosophica) *de anima*, and has accordingly made two distinct parts in the treatment of his subject, one devoted to the organic, the other to the super-organic life. The present volume deals with organic life in the plant and the animal. These organisms are studied philosophically, of course, that is, as to the essential nature of their informing principle of vitality and in interest of the light they throw upon the working and nature of the human soul—the noblest principle of life in the world of organisms. But whilst adhering to this ancient conception of psychology, the author is very far from treating his subject in an antiquated fashion. The main bulk of his argumentation is, of course, to be found in the works of St. Thomas and other eminent scholastics; but in passing through his own mind it has undergone a simplification and clarification and an arrangement that make the reading of his book easy and pleasant as well as

profitable. Moreover, he gladly admits that psychology has advanced in recent times, especially on the side of physiological phenomena. These modern developments he has assimilated and accorded them their place in the scholastic system. Students who have acquired their knowledge of psychology from the manuals published a generation ago will probably be surprised at finding in a Latin text-book plates illustrating the microscopy of vegetation, and engravings of the cerebrum, spinal cord, nerve cells and neurons, motor-reflexes, etc. This pictorial apparatus may not be deemed essential to a work on philosophy, but it is certainly helpful to the student and is significant of the development of neo-scholasticism in the direction which is most demanded at the present time—viz., in the sensible facts and empirico-scientific classifications and immediate inferences.

Besides this, another feature will commend the book to the student, viz., the perfect transparency of the style. The author has undertaken a work of magnitude, one which will probably be read most by professors or advanced students. He might, therefore, have easily been tempted to adopt an elevated strain of Latinity. Instead of this, however, he has adhered throughout to that perfectly simple diction which helps to make the works of St. Thomas and the other great schoolmen so luminous and satisfying.

Though treating of a different division of tthe philosophical system, Father Castelein's "Institutes of Moral Philosophy" may be brought here into connection with the foregoing work because of its similarity of view-point and method. The key to the treatment is set down at the start: *Fontes Philosophiae moralis sunt tum principia tum facta; principia, quibus regitur methodus deductiva et facta quae sunt elementa methodi inductivae.* This standpoint and method—the blending of deduction with induction—gives scientific solidity to the author's system without depriving it of the interest which accompanies the concrete or fact-element. The conclusions demonstrated in theodicy and psychology are unfolded so as to explain, classify and reduce to law the ethical facts which history and experience present. A signal excellence in Father Castelein's work is the prominence given to the subjects about which men's minds are busiest to-day. Though the fundamental and traditional questions of ethics receive their just share of discussion, the actual problems of the hour are treated with special fulness. Thus the questions centering in socialism and the rights of property receive a hundred pages of the book. The wage question, the relation between capital and labor and kindred topics are given proportionate space. An appendix of a hundred pages contains some important and interesting matters regarding the history of socialism, the effects of modern industry on the economic

order, comparative labor statistics, a brief exposition and critique of various recent systems of economics, etc. In compass Father Castelein's treatise holds a middle place between the well-known Latin manual of Father Cathrein and the two volumes on the same subject contributed by Father Meyer to the *Cursus Philosophiae Lacensis*. We can give the work no higher commendation than to say that for depth, breadth, orderliness and perspicuity it fully deserves a place by the side of Meyer's *Institutiones* and Cathrein's *Moral Philosophie*.

F. P. S.

MEDITATIONS ON PSALMS PENITENTIAL. By the author of "Meditations on the Psalms of the Little Office." 12mo., pp. vii., 153. St. Louis: B. Herder.

This is one of the most satisfying books of meditation that has come under our notice. Too often such books place before us the particular application of certain truths to the needs of the writer and the result of such application; they appeal to a limited number only. In other books too much attention is given to erudition and too little to spirituality. In them there is more discussion than prayer; they appeal to the head rather than to the heart. But the end of meditation is to move the heart; to bring us to sorrow and love and service. The book before us fulfils these requirements.

The author has chosen his subject well. He has taken those seven songs of the Church that have been the voice of her penance in every age. From the wealth of her treasure in the Psalter she singles them out especially for use in her public affairs and commends them for the private devotion of her faithful children. They bear a message of consolation and hope not only to the sons and daughters of the Church, but to every weary soul that wanders through this vale of tears disappointed, tempted, fallen. They hold up before us the picture of the penitent king who has fallen and risen. "They are deep living wells. The profound spiritual experience which they reveal finds a response in the yearning of every unsatisfied heart; the assured faith of their inspired writer is a beacon light to the perplexed and despondent. In them the true penitent has an inexhaustible fount of devotion; for the contrite soul can find no fitter words wherein to break silence and utter its lamentations before God." The Latin and English text are printed in parallel columns, with a running commentary in English. Then follows a brief sketch of the history of the psalm and then the meditation proper. The meditation is short and the prayer that succeeds it is long. This is exactly as it should be, although we generally find the reverse arrangement. Page after page is enriched with references to other parts of the Sacred Text and to the Fathers. The

writer has caught the spirit of the composer, and this is praise indeed. To all who know the beauty and pathos of the Psalms Penitential we recommend this book that they may know them better; to those who do not know them, we recommend it that they may learn them well.

SYNODORUM ARCHIDIOECESEOS NEO-EBORACENSIS COLLECTIO, Excellentissimi ac Reverendissimi Michaelis Augustini Corrigan Archiepiscopi Jussu Edita. Neo-Eboraci: Typis et Sumptibus Bibliothecae Cathedralis.

This new edition of the synodal decrees of New York was brought out as a memorial of the golden archiepiscopal jubilee of the see. It is a most becoming souvenir, for it shows the development of the diocese during the half century in a striking manner. Its various decrees which regulate the discipline and ceremonial of the Church to suit the requirements of the times without changing them in any essential point, speak to us of phenomenal growth. They tell us of wise, watchful heads, who observed and planned carefully, and of faithful, obedient followers who aided them well in perfecting the work. The successive stages of growth can be followed in the series of synods. The volume will be very useful not only for the priests of New York, where the statutes are in force, but also for the bishops and priests of other dioceses that have not yet fully developed. They will find in it answers to many questions that have not arisen in their own midst, and models for many disciplinary regulations, which experience has shown to be wise and useful. The book is very nicely gotten up, well arranged and well indexed.

BREVIARIUM ROMANUM. 4 vols., 16mo., half mor., $6.50. Mechlin: H. Dessain. New York: Benziger Brothers. 1901.

This is the latest and smallest Breviary. It contains all the offices, and it is the most convenient book for those who wish to carry it in the pocket. In shape and appearance and weight it resembles a small Horae Diurnae, and at first sight most persons refuse to believe that it is the complete Breviary. The second exclamation of surprise is heard when the book is opened. The paper and type are excellent. It is not true, as it was formerly, that a small book must be printed in type that is almost illegible. The great improvements in paper-making enable the printer to use a type that is comparatively large and remarkably clear. When this book was first announced, many persons expressed doubt as to the possibility of making it useful. Some seemed to think that the limit in compactness had been reached, and that any attempt to go further would prove a failure. Such is not the case. This Breviary is all that the publishers intended it to be—the smallest book of its kind, with excellent paper and type.

70758

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

PERIODICAL